FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 113 *10 June 1983*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Reagan's Statement on Arms Talks Condemned AA 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jun]
U.S. Said Practicing Official Deceit on Arms Talks AA 2
Kornilov Commentary AA 3
USSR-U.S. START Delegation's Plenary Meeting Noted AA 4
USSR-U.S. INF Plenary Meeting Reported AA 4
Bulgarian MBFR Talks Delegate's Speech Cited AA 4

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Reportage on NATO Council Session Held in Paris CC 1
Timing, Location Scored [Mnatsakanov] CC 1
Luns, Shultz Statements CC 2
USSR's Marshal Petrov Denounces Rogers' NATO Plans CC 3
[Bratislava PRAVDA 7 Jun]
Further Reportage on Sixth UNCTAD Session CC 7
IZVESTIYA Previews Session [4 Jun] CC 7
Text of Government Message [PRAVDA 7 Jun] CC 8
'Imperialist' vs Socialist Approach CC 9
'Peace Through Force' Triumphs at Williamsburg CC 10
[Gerasimov]
Nonaligned Summit Reviewed for Soviet Public CC 14

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Said 'Sabotaging' Prospect of CW Ban A 1
[Petrov in PRAVDA 10 Jun]
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Views U.S. Naval Strategy [4 Jun] A 4
Article on 'Reaganism and Outside World' Cited A 6
POST Claim of Improved U.S.-USSR Ties Disputed A 8
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jun]
House Allocation for Military Construction Scored A 8
Explosion of Nuclear Device in Nevada Reported A 8

CHINA

Preparations for PRC Army Changes Reported B 1
History of Soviet-Chinese Friendship Stressed B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Further on Nakasone Williamsburg Remarks C 1
[Vladimirov]
U.S. Military Interest in North Japan Rapped C 2
'Discontent' With Japanese Economic Policies Noted C 2
25th Anniversary of USSR-Japan Society Marked C 3

SOUTH ASIA

DRA's Ratebzad Comments on World Peace D 1
USSR-DRA Economic, Technical Cooperation Planned D 1

EASTERN EUROPE

USSR-GDR Joint Commission Meets in Moscow F 1
Discusses Agriculture F 1
Tikhonov Receives Schuerer F 1
Solomentsev Receives Serbian Official Krstic F 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Jun]

WESTERN EUROPE

Koivisto Ends Moscow Visit; Heads for Kiev G 1
Second Andropov Meeting G 1
Details Not Disclosed [Helsinki] G 1
Send-Off Ceremony Held [PRAVDA 9 Jun] G 1
T.V. Shows Andropov G 2
France's Foreign Policy 'Following' U.S. Line G 2
'Departing' From 'Independence' G 2
[Falin in IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]
Increasing Role in NATO G 4
[PRAVDA 8 Jun]
Mideast, PLO Policies Attacked G 5
Greek Premier Criticizes U.S., NATO Missile Plans G 6

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Gromyko, Jordanian Envoy Discuss Mideast H 1
Arkhipov, Algerian Aides Hold Discussion H 1
[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]
USSR To Supply PLO With New Weapons [Doha QNA] H 1
U.S.-Soviet Mideast Cooperation Denied H 2
[Polonskiy]
Special Envoy Walters' Mission in Mideast Viewed H 3
[Yenikeyev]
Delhi Rally Protests Anti-Tudeh Repressions H 4
Soviet-Arab Amity Body Celebrates Anniversary H 4
[PRAVDA 3 Jun]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Angola's FAPLA Reports 'Successes' Against UNITA J 1
Additional Information on OAU Summit Meeting 1
'Difficulties' Reported J 1
'Noble Role' [Kachanov] J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

'Contadora Group' Convenes on C.A. Settlement [PRAVDA 6 Jun] K 1
U.S. Caribbean Maneuvers, Expansion 'Provocative' K 2
Reported CIA Activity in Nicaragua Criticized K 2
Moscow Hosts Soviet-Mexican Economic Symposium [IZVESTIYA 2 Jun] K 3
Briefs: Argentine Power Station K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Draft Law on Labor Collectives Discussed [SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 31 May] R 1
USSR Deputy Communications Minister Dies 'Suddenly' [IZVESTIYA 9 Jun] R 2
Several Executed for Economic Crimes in Georgia [AFP] R 2

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Academician Views Productivity, Wage Incentives S 1
Kazakh SSR To Increase Consumer Goods Production S 2

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Recent Crop Sowing Progress Summarized T 1
CSA Reported Cited T 1
Agriculture Ministry Report T 1
RSFSR CSA's Data T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Inventors, Rationalizers Society Holds Congress U 1
CPSU Central Committee Greetings U 1
Dolgikh Addresses Congress U 1
Review Report Given U 2
Tavriya Electrophoresis Experiment Results Viewed U 2

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Ustinov To Command Baltic Military Exercise V 1
PRAVDA Interviews KGB Border Guards Chief [28 May] V 1

REAGAN'S STATEMENT ON ARMS TALKS CONDEMNED

PM101101 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jun 83 Second Edition p 3

[TASS Commentary: "On the U.S. President's Statement"]

[Text] U.S. President Ronald Reagan made a statement on 8 June in connection with the resumption in Geneva of the Soviet-American talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments.

The aim of the U.S. Administration's directives at the Geneva talks, the President said, is to "adjust" the U.S. position at the talks to bring it into line with the recommendations drawn by General Scowcroft's commission.

It is well known that this commission, comprising former defense secretaries, was set up by the White House to push through Congress programs on new MX missiles and other strategic armaments opposed by some U.S. congressmen. When establishing the Scowcroft commission, the President vaguely promised the legislators, apparently for the sake of camouflage, to undertake "new efforts" at the Geneva talks. In exchange, as is known, the administration secured congressional approval for the rapid development of the system of new strategic missiles, MX.

Ronald Reagan, by his statement, now seems to be trying to concretize his promise to Congress. What new things did he say in connection with the resumption of the Geneva talks? The head of the White House, using vague formulations, tried to convince the public that the United States, allegedly, decided to adopt a "more flexible" position at the talks. This "flexibility," as his statement shows, does not in any way affect the essence of Washington's position directed, as before, at gaining military superiority and pressing the Soviet Union into unilateral disarmament.

"The majority of experts in the Reagan administration," THE NEW YORK TIMES points out today, "believe that the new approach will not help in finding a way out of the impasse at the Soviet-American talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments." Paul Warnke, former head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-American SALT talks, in an interview with the ABC television network, expressed the opinion that Reagan's "new" proposals will be unacceptable to the Soviet Union. "They envisage a very sharp reduction in the basis of the USSR's strategic forces," Warnke declared. "As to the United States, it reserves the right to produce a thousand more warheads for the MX."

What then remains of Ronald Reagan's calls to conduct the talks in a "constructive spirit"? First, the U.S. Administration launched its new military programs of building up strategic armaments and then started a salutary talk about "flexibility" and "new approach" at the Geneva negotiations. So, no desire to achieve a mutually acceptable accord, mentioned by the President, is in sight. On the contrary, his statement reveals something quite different -- the aspiration to undermine by any means the principle of equality and equal security of the sides on which rested the SALT-I and SALT II talks. As a matter of fact, Reagan does not conceal that the essence of his "initiative" remains, just as before, to limit, first of all, the number of ballistic missiles -- above all land-based ones -- which make up the backbone of the Soviet Union's strategic defense potential.

The American President's declaration that the United States is now prepared to "raise the ceiling" for the overall number of ballistic missiles is nothing but adjustment towards toughening the American position in connection with the Pentagon's changed plans which envisage, specifically, as already mentioned, the deployment shortly of two new types of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

It is noteworthy that the White House chief in his statement kept completely silent on the constructive Soviet proposals which envisage deep reductions of all types of strategic armaments with the simultaneous blocking of new channels of the arms race. He did not mention at all the USSR's concrete proposals contained in the draft treaty tabled by the Soviet delegation at the negotiations in Geneva. Nor did the President react to the Soviet Government's statement of 28 May this year which advanced concrete ways toward reaching a mutually acceptable accord at the Geneva talks.

What then is the worth of the President's pronouncement that "due largely to Soviet intransigence, we have not yet made meaningful progress on the central issues"? What is the worth of the President's declaration that he is "firmly committed to take whatever steps are necessary" which would provide for "significant reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear arsenals"? These are mere words, and nothing more.

U.S. PRACTICING 'OFFICIAL DECEIT' ON ARMS TALKS

LD100914 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 9 Jun 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Vitaliy Sobolev]

[Text] The NATO Council session has opened in Paris. As AP reports, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz will work at the session for maximum support from the allies for U.S. strategy [word indistinct] of medium-range nuclear weapons. The same support was being squeezed out of the allies by U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger at the NATO Committee for Military Planning a week ago in Brussels, and before him President Reagan was working on the same thing at the Williamsburg summit. Such endeavors by U.S. leaders illustrate, on the one hand, how far their true intentions are from their peace-loving speeches, and on the other how they fear West European public opinion which is certainly not gladdened by the U.S. new nuclear gifts. While some allies voiced the support that Washington is so concerned about, others, despite everything, are delaying -- these include Denmark, the Netherlands, and Belgium -- and Greek Prime Minister Papandreou called Reagan's missile program destablizing to an extremely dangerous degree.

The efforts of Shultz and other figures of the U.S. Administration are accompanied by further official deceit aimed at uninformed people. The Washington leaders affirm, for instance, that the deployment of the new U.S. medium-range missiles will immediately advance the talks in Geneva on arms of that type, since it will force the Soviet Union to make concessions. It is as if they in Washington have not heard the USSR's repeated warnings that the deployment of those missiles will force the Soviet Union to take timely and effective measures in response.

The NATO leadership publicly insists that the Soviet Union should make its own proposals. Are they not aware of the numerous and constructive initiatives of our country, which does not want to have a single missile more than the NATO countries in Europe? The USSR has been proposing to liquidate altogether the nuclear weapons on that continent, to liquidate medium-range weapons or radically reduce them as a start. It has been proposing to establish nuclear-free zones in various parts of Europe. During the visit the Finnish president just made to our country, Comrade Andropov put forward a new initiative -- to give nuclear-free status to the Baltic Sea waters. How do they reply, those who are allegedly thirsting for new Soviet proposals? That same Secretary of State Shultz hastened to reject this initiative. The Soviet Union, he declared, wants others to be free of nuclear weapons, but not itself. One might think that the Baltic Sea washes not the shores of the USSR but the shores of the United States. What sleepy dunces is the secretary of state addressing?

The administration's promises to demonstrate a new approach to the problem of limiting and reducing strategic armaments are also essentially deceitful. As the American press itself testifies, these promises are empty demagogy. Nor does Washington's big lie reach its target among the majority of the West Europeans. NATO leaders publicly voice satisfaction that for the first time in 17 years the session of the bloc's council is being held in Paris. However, for many Frenchmen the appearance of NATO causes other feelings. There are plan to hold a grand demonstration in Paris on 19 June under the slogan of the struggle for peace and disarmament. Preparations for it are in full swing.

Kornilov Commentary

LD101243 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 10 Jun 83

["Who Is Sabotaging the Talks in Geneva" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS -- TASS commentator Yuriy Kornilov writes:

However hard the Washington administration may try to pose as "peacemakers," facts show again and again that the pivot of its foreign policy course is the further buildup of nuclear armaments and the conversion of West Europe into the Pentagon's nuclear hostage. This was in effect confirmed once more by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz who said that the NATO Council session in Paris that Washington was prepared for "reasonable talks" on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe, but everything, he alleged, depended on whether the Russians would continue to be uncooperative. What did he have in mind? Moscow, Shultz asserted, creates problems in such issues as Poland and Afghanistan.

This statement is not just another attempt to distort the essence of the Soviet Union's peaceable foreign policy. It makes clear for all to see that although the United States talks of its desire for negotiations, it does not in fact wish success for the talks and does not seek a businesslike discussion of the problems on the agenda in Geneva. What is more, having decided to deploy American Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe Washington, as we see, even lays down, through Shultz, certain "preliminary conditions" which have only one objective -- to sabotage the talks, to predetermine their failure. On the eve of the NATO Council session this line of Washington was confirmed also by U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger, who said directly that Washington was proceeding from the assumption that no agreement would be signed in Geneva and that it was now going full steam ahead with preparations for deploying American missiles in West Europe.

The blocking of the Geneva talks is also the aim behind the statements made recently by a number of high-ranking representatives of the Washington administration, including those by President R. Reagan. Reduced to their essentials these statements say that it would be allegedly easier to reach agreement after the deployment of new American missiles in Europe. This is a serious delusion on the part of the USA. If the American side continues to make similar assertions it will be able to see how groundless such calculations are. As was stressed most definitely in the recent statement of the Soviet Government, if agreement on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe, excluding the deployment of new American missiles, is blocked and an additional threat created to the security of the USSR and its allies, the Soviet Union will take timely and effective measures in response.

USSR-U.S. START DELEGATIONS' PLENARY MEETING NOTED

LD091448 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Geneva June 9 TASS -- The USSR and U.S. delegations to the talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms had a plenary meeting here today.

USSR-U.S. INF PLENARY MEETING REPORTED

LD091212 Moscow TASS in English 1051 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Geneva June 9 TASS -- The Soviet and U.S. delegations today had a plenary meeting here at the talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe.

BULGARIAN MBFR TALKS DELEGATE'S SPEECH CITED

LD091511 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Vienna June 9 TASS -- Lyubomir Shopov, the leader of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, made a speech at today's plenary session at the talks on mutual reduction of the armed forces and armaments in central Europe.

As the journalists were told at a press conference, the Bulgarian representative, having declared in support of the proposals tabled by the socialist countries -- direct participants in the talks -- on February 17 this year emphasized that the initiatives give a real opportunity to take the talks bout of deadlock and to start reducing the troops of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization together with their armaments in central Europe without delay and bring the process up to the agreed-upon goal -- the maintenance of parity in the strength of the armed forces of the sides at a lower level.

The delegate of Bulgaria drew attention to the fact that the West has virtually given no reply to these constructive proposals which make it possible to reach a mutally acceptable accord in the shortest possible time on the basis of the principle of undiminished security of any of the parties. The Western participants continue to drag out the talks in an attempt to revive the "discussion of figures."

A legitimate question arises: What is of importance to the West -- a continuation of fruitless arguments which do not bring an accord any closer, but postpone it rather, or a real progress which would meet the principal goal of the talks? The socialist countries' proposals open up the most effective and simple way to reaching agreement. There can be no justifications for further procrastination of the Vienna talks, the Bulgarian diplomat emphasized in conclusion.

REPORTAGE ON NATO COUNCIL SESSION HELD IN PARIS

Timing, Location Scored

LD100428 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1945 GMT 9 Jun 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] In Paris today, as already reported, the session of the NATO Council started. I should like in this connection to pay attention to two substantial points.

In the first place, the choice of time, and secondary the choice of place for holding the NATO session.

Remember the events of the last few days: At the session in Williamsburg, at Reagan's dictate, a statement was adopted on a full approval of the course of the nuclear missile arms race and the deployment in West Europe of new American nuclear missiles targeted against the Soviet Union and its allies.

Then Washington's main nuclear missile commercial traveler, Weinberger was sent to West Europe at top speed. Here he tried to get the same full approval of Washington's course from other, junior, members of NATO, especially from those who are putting forward serious and entirely justified objections to this arsonist and adventurist course; such counties as Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Greece.

Commenting on the outcome of that trip, THE WASHINGTON POST reports: Many West European leaders who are facing stormy public demonstrations against the missiles would very much like to have heard from Weinberger that agreement could be still reached before the deployment of the missiles.

Agreement at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva was referred to. As you see, West European leaders -- at any rate those in question -- are almost begging Washington in almost the following way. May there be agreement, may there be no missiles!

The American minister had only one answer to these entreaties: Unless we deploy the missiles, there will be no fruitful talks.

Just think, the present Geneva talks -- Weinberger says bluntly -- mean nothing, but when the Pershings and Tomahawks arrive from across the Atlantic, then it will be possible to put pressure on the Soviet Union and force it to make concessions -- then there will be real talks.

Well, what can one say concerning such assertions? They are, of course, not original. Big and little Weinbergers on both sides of the Atlantic repeat them almost daily, but this does not make them any less ridiculous. If in Washington, they really believe that the new weapons system will be a trump card for the Americans at the talks, then they should know that these trump cards are fakes. This was declared by Comrade Andropov in his report devoted to 60th anniversary of the USSR on 21 December of last year. But in Washington, they are chasing their militant line despite everything. Moreover, they are hastening and getting nervous, trying, so to speak, to strike while the iron is hot, before the Williamsburg noise has died down completely, trying to place all their NATO partners of various calibers at the front line -- this is the aim pursued at the Paris session of the NATO Council, where the tone is set by another high-ranking Washington emissary -- Secretary of State Shultz

True, it is said that the missiles question is not the only one at that session, that other aspects of East-West relations will allegedly be discussed, and particularly the question of economic cooperation. But bombastic declarations can hardly deceive anyone. It is indeed clear, that the sinister nuclear missile storm cloud being chased over Europe seriously poisons the whole atmosphere on the continent, disturbs any relations between East and West.

The NATO session has been convened in the French capital, and this has provoked the most lively comment in the Western press. Some write of this with chagrin, even indignation, others with obvious gloating. There was a time, when in Paris they would proudly declare that the White House master was not a shepherd and the countries of West Europe not his flock. Now in Paris, such talk is no longer heard. It is as if someone on the Seine would not be averse to even taking on himself the role of some kind of European herdsboy of the American shepherd. We remember, in Paris, as in London, they do not want to even hear about taking into account the French and British nuclear missile forces at the talks on limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. These forces, they say, are purely national, they were created only to perform tasks of national defense and have no connection with NATO. It was known that all this was nonsense before, but now this is confirmed by the demonstrative NATO session in the French capital.

In an interview on Sudwestfunk radio station, FRG Defense Minister Woerner literally declared the following: France, he said, is a reliable partner of NATO and the French nuclear forces play an important role for the defense of the FRG. Pay attention: This means not only for France itself but for the FRG too.

The Soviet Union, continues the Bonn minister, is forced to take into account the nuclear weapons of France as an additional factor of risk and an additional means of deterrence.

It would seem that these words -- if one of course disengages oneself from the NATO jargon -- only confirm the point of view of the Soviet Union that it is necessary at the talks to take into account the French and British nuclear arsenals. But Manfred Woerner has quite a different logic. From what he himself has said, he suddenly makes a completely unexpected conclusion: To take into account these Anglo-French arsenals, he says, means to make the FRG defenseless and oust the Americans from their extremely important positions in Europe.

In a word, comrades, at a command from Washington the North Atlantic alliance, or rather those who boss this militaristic alliance, are laying themselves out to set I before European peoples a fiat accompli, to turn them into nuclear captives of the Pentagon, to achieve military superiority over our country. But they will never see this. As a result of the reckless actions of the militaristic forces, above all the American Administration, an extremely complex and even critical situation has been created in Europe. Under these conditions, our country insistently calls for a peaceful solution to be found to urgent tasks, the tasks of limiting and reducing armaments, above all nuclear armaments. We call for a return to the road of detente, both political and military. Goodbye, comrades.

Luns, Shultz Statements

LD092319 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Report by correspondent Pavel Kasparov from Paris]

[Text] Today, 17 years after France left the bloc's military organization, the NATO Council session again opened in Paris with a torrent of speeches by French Premier Mauroy, Danish envoy (Jereman Jensen), and NATO Secretary General Luns.

The session of the 16 ministers of the North Atlantic alliance member countries will continue in camera. In accordance with the session's declared agenda, questions of stepping up NATO's conventional and nuclear weapons and of further improving them as well as plans for increasing the military spending by member states of this aggressive, military-political bloc will be discussed.

Meanwhile, as emerges from the statements by Joseph Luns and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, the participants in the NATO Council session above all are to once again confirm the U.S. plan for the deployment of about 600 new U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe and to speak out, in connection with this, on the question of East-West relations.

Neither Luns nor Shultz, moreover, have taken any pains even to conceal that they are expecting unconditional approval of the so-called automatic deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in the NATO countries from the participants of the supreme governing organ of the North Atlantic alliance, that is to say, without waiting for the results of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva.

This session, stated the U.S. secretary of state yesterday on arriving in Paris, should be an illustration of the inviolable cohesion of the alliance. Luns also spoke at yesterday's press conference of the special, even extreme significance of the present session of the NATO Council. Clearly echoing Washington, he tried to push through the idea that the installation of a limited number of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe will without fail lead to progress at the talks between the USSR and the United States on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe. In his words, it is precisely the Soviet Union that does not wish the success of the Geneva talks.

The NATO secretary general nevertheless, never mentioned the constructive Soviet proposals which are aimed exactly at getting these talks out of the deadend into which the well-known position of the Reagan administration has led them.

USSR'S MARSHAL PETROV DENOUNCES ROGERS' NATO PLANS

AU081330 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 7 Jun 83 p 6

[APN interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union Vasiliy Petrov, USSR deputy minister of defense and chief commander of the USSR ground forces: "Attempts to Camouflage NATO's Aggressiveness" -- place and date of interview not given]

[Text] [Question] General Rogers, the chief commander of NATO troops in Europe, claims that the Warsaw Pact countries have a 4 to 1 preponderance over NATO in the area of conventional weapons and the number of troops. Is this true?

[Answer] This statement of Gen Rogers is destined for uninformed people. I can responsibly declare, that today there is an approximate balance of forces between the Warsaw Pact and NATO in conventional arms. The combat potentials of the NATO armed forces and the Warsaw Pact states are roughly equivalent. On the European Continent and the adjacent seas, NATO has at its disposal a sufficiently balanced strategic make-up of armed forces, an extensive collection of conventional arms, nuclear weapons of an operative-tactical nature and various means for these weapons' delivery, a great number of guided anti-tank missiles, and a gigantic pool of combat aircraft.

A total of 94 NATO divisions (including Spain) are facing in Europe 78 divisions of the Warsaw Pact. At the same time, you have to remember that the American divisions have 16,000 to 19,000 men and the West German divisions more than 20,000, while the divisions of the armies of the Warsaw Pact have 11,000 men at the most.

When we consider the difference in the complete numerical strength of the divisions, we will find out that the actual correlation of forces in Europe is in NATO's favor. It is also generally known, that the total strength of NATO's armed forces in Europe has reached 3 million men and that, altogether, the armies of the bloc's countries have 5 million men.

Let us also take a look at the so-called "tank threat" on the part of the USSR. The Warsaw Pact countries did really have more tanks. However, after Spain joined NATO, even this insignificant preponderance has vanished. In order to deceive the public, representatives of the United States and NATO are resorting to juggling figures. When it is advantageous for them, they include only those tanks that are subordinated to the joint command of the bloc's armed forces in Europe. Thereby, they significantly reduce the number of tanks in their ownership (supposedly, they have less than 12,000 of them). In reality, however, there are more than 17,000 tanks directly in the NATO countries' troops. Aside from them, some 1,500 American tanks and 6,500 tanks of the West European NATO countries are stockpiled in arsenals in Europe. This means that they have a total of 25,000 tanks, which is roughly equivalent to the tank pool of the Warsaw Pact countries.

Besides, we cannot ignore the fact that the NATO command is planning to add to its troops' equipment some 9,000 tanks of a new type (Abrams, Leopard II) in the next 5 to 7 years, with the aim of further reinforcing the strike power of its troops. The combat potentials of these tanks are 1.5 to 2 times superior to those of the present tanks. In the opinion of the U.S. military command, by the mid-eighties this will ensure for the NATO bloc a significant preponderance in tanks over the Warsaw Pact countries.

The NATO troops are receiving large amounts of new combat vehicles for the infantry, equipment for the field artillery, anti-tank and anti-aircraft guided missiles, helicopters, as well as means of radioelectronic warfare. Rocket launchers with salve fire and an increased range are being adjusted for charges with homing guidance elements. By the end of 1988, U.S. ground forces will have more than 1,500 helicopter gunships.

[Question] What, in your opinion, is the role of the conventional arms and the U.S. Armed Forces?

[Answer] The military-political leadership of the United States is apparently realizing that the use of nuclear arms against the USSR, regardless of the extent and their number, will be followed by the inescapable retaliation of the whole nuclear power of the Soviet Armed Forces, not only against the territory of the forward bases in Europe, but also against the territory of the United States as the chief material and military-technical base. That is why the American command proceeds from the premise that it is necessary to develop the forces in a multifaceted fashion and to equip them with devices of conventional warfare, which are to be used far away from the American Continent, in the European theater of military operations, and which -- owing to their power, precision, and and effectiveness -- come very close to tactical nuclear weapons. Aside from this, the American command assigns to the conventional forces also other tasks, such as participation in local and regional conflicts, support for reactionary regimes, and intimidation of forces that are fighting against the preparation of a new war. It is not by coincidence that the report of the Committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces states that the role of the U.S. conventional forces in fulfilling the deterrent function is growing.

The whole military system of NATO in Europe is being maintained at a high level of combat preparedness: organs of the chief command of the allied armed forces of NATO have been established -- chief commands for the three arenas of ground military operations and for the Atlantic Ocean; formations of troops and communications systems have been deployed; and the staffs have drafted plans for future operations, laid down the combat tasks for the troops, and are working on enhancing the mobilization potentials. Everything is ready today for a speedy completion of the deployment of troops and for their transition toward attack.

[Question] In comparing the ground forces of the USSR and the United States, many people in the West are trying to force on the public the idea that the strength of the Soviet Armed Forces allegedly exceeds the essential needs for defense and that, therefore, the Soviet Union is engaged in preparations for an aggression. What can you tell us in this connection?

[Answer] Indeed, the total number of divisions in our country is higher than in the United States. And this is quite natural as the width of the territory, the geographic and strategic position of the Soviet Union is such that it must ensure a balance of forces not only in Europe but also in other regions adjacent to its borders.

The aggregate length of the USSR state border is 67,000 km, of which 20,000 km are on land. In view of [the location of] American military bases and the formations of troops of countries that support U.S. policy, this border must be protected and defended in the West, in the Far East, and in the South. At the same time, it must be kept in mind that there are 8,000 to 10,000 km between Soviet troops at the western and eastern borders, which is twice the distance between Western Europe and the territory of the United States. When we consider all these factors, it becomes quite clear why the ground troops are being maintained in such a combat composition. The task of these troops is to reliably safeguard the inviolability of the USSR borders.

[Question] Gen Rogers has submitted his plan for modernizing NATO troops by equipping them with weapons of precision homing in on targets, with the latest devices for "electronic warfare," and so forth. Can all this raise the "nuclear threshold" or the reliability of the Atlantic defense?

[Answer] Gen Rogers' plan is aimed at significantly enhancing the NATO armed forces' combat potentials by equipping them with new types of precision guidance conventional weapons, as well as by means of offensive reconnaissance complexes capable of carrying out reconnaissance, transmitting in a realistic time span the exact geographical coordinates of targets, and liquidating them, following their discovery. The inclusion of these devices in the equipment will greatly increase accuracy in hitting targets, reduce the time necessary for completing the firing tasks, greatly increase the threat of war in Europe, and will charge every conflict between NATO and the Warsaw Pact with [the danger of] growing into a nuclear conflict.

The actual aim is to draw conventional arms closer to tactical nuclear weapons. After all, these devices of precision targeting will fulfill functions that used to be fulfilled by tactical nuclear weapons. By means of these devices, combat operations will assume an exceedingly destructive character, even if nuclear weapons are not used. Ultimately, even if the "nuclear threshhold" is maintained, the mass employment of the new devices of precision targeting will, in effect, be analogous to a nuclear attack.

Rogers' plan does not mean in the least that NATO is renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons. And no matter how much Gen Rogers dons the garb of a peacemaker, his plan of complementing armament will lead to a new round in the arms race.

[Question] From time to time the Americans "threaten" that they will withdraw their troops from the FRG and intimidate the public with the vision of the Soviet Union "conquering Europe" without a single shot. How do you assess such assertions?

[Answer] It is clear to everyone that the United States raises this issue every time it wants its NATO allies to increase their contributions for military purposes. This is done to speed up the arms race and to involve the European nations in new American military adventures.

It is equally clear that the Americans are not planning to withdraw their troops. All such statements are only designed to exert pressure on the partners. In 1977 there were 292,000 American soldiers in Europe, today the number of U.S. Army members in Europe has reached 340,000. This means an annual increase by 10,000 men. At the end of 1982, Gen Rogers asked Congress to raise the number of troops in Europe to 350,000 men. This is how the trend of the growth of U.S. armed forces in Europe is being maintained. What is more, the present U.S. representatives, who have declared a "crusade" against the USSR, regard the American military presence in various parts of the world as the most important instrument of safeguarding American interests and achieving military supremacy on a global scale. A document of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Congress explicitly states that the withdrawal from or the reduction of U.S. troops in Europe would have "disastrous consequences for U.S. interests and would call forth conflicts within NATO."

And now to the other aspect of the question. The assertion that after the withdrawal of the U.S. troops from Europe the West European countries would remain unprotected against the "Soviet threat" is a deception. Even the very sentence about the endeavor of the Soviet Union to "conquer" Western Europe is a gross distortion and falsification of the objectives and the tasks of Soviet foreign policy. Everybody knows that the Soviet Union has pledged that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons, and that together with the other Warsaw Pact member countries it has proposed to the NATO countries to conclude an agreement on the mutual nonuse of force against one another. To this very day the NATO countries have not responded in any way to these peace proposals, however.

And as regards the "defenselessness" of the United States' West European NATO allies, the following figures, taken from a Senate Commission on Foreign Affairs, are applicable. In Europe, the West European NATO countries provide 91 percent of the ground forces and 89 percent of the air forces. The group of these countries' armies has three-quarters of NATO's tank pool and nine-tenths of all tank divisions. The armed forces of the NATO West European countries exceed 3 million men, and if we add the reservists to this figure, the West European allies have more than 6 million men.

[Question] What is your opinion about the theory of the "second wave attack," envisaged in the "Rogers' plan"?

[Answer] The foundation of this theory is the long-known American concept of an "air force-ground forces operation," envisaging organizing and carrying our joint actions by ground forces and air forces, in which target, place, and time are coordinated, delivering deep strikes at the Warsaw Pact troops first, without using nuclear weapons in the initial stage of the conflict.

What makes the concept of the "deep strike" so attractive to the NATO militarists? Comprehensively speaking, the adoption of this concept will constitute another step on the path of increasing tension in Europe. These are new orders for the U.S. military-industrial complex which expects to make huge profits when it becomes responsible for ensuring the material aspect of this concept. The Rogers' plan is permeated with the spirit of aggressive endeavors and envisages first unexpected actions.

The "non-nuclear" orientation of the Rogers' doctrine is an attempt to mislead European nations, camouflage the aggressive essence of its military policy and step up the preparation of war in Europe.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON SIXTH UNCTAD SESSION

IZVESTIYA Previews Session

PM090923 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 June 83 Morning Edition p 3

[Candidate of Economic Sciences I. Yermachenkov "International Commentary": "An Important Forum"]

[Text] In the next few days, representatives of 168 states will meet in Belgrade to discuss at the Sixth UNCTAD Session very important questions connected with the broadening of international economic cooperation. Trade relations (including the development of relations between countries with different socioeconomic systems), currency and financial problems, including developing countries' financial debts, the creation of an independent economy by young liberated countries, the improvement of UNCTAD's activity, and the giving of assistance to national liberation movements are, together with other topical questions, included on the forthcoming session's agenda.

During UNCTAD's 19-year existence, this organization has taken a considerable number of useful decisions to increase trade and create a new international economic order. Principles of strict observance of equality, mutual advantage, respect for sovereignty, and noninterference in the internal affairs of states, as well as the observance of contractual commitments, have been established. The development of economic relations in the world during this period, has shown that good resolutions and recommendations by UNCTAD aimed at eliminating discrimination and protectionism in trade and at developing mutually advantageous economic ties, do not by themselves lead to the reorganization of international economic cooperation on a just democratic basis, if they are energetically carried out by some countries and sabotaged by others, and if one group of countries strictly fulfills the resolutions adopted whereas another hinders their implementation by creating additional difficulties and artificial barriers.

The improvement of UNCTAD's activity can be attained through discussion of the organization's structure. But, to judge by the speeches of Washington officials, the United States intends during the course of the Belgrade session to seek to diminish the organization's role and reduce its effectiveness and efficiency. It is seeking, in particular, to restrict UNCTAD's mandate in discussing problems of trade policy and international currency and finance questions.

The Soviet Union supports the developing countries' efforts to transform UNCTAD into a universal trade and economic forum. It firmly opposes the depreciation of this organization's role and any attempts to revise UNCTAD in the interests of individual states and their financial institutions.

The forthcoming Belgrade session will take place in conditions of further exacerbation of the crisis in the capitalist countries' economies, and a continuing worsening of the economic situation in the developing countries, and in a situation where the Western countries are seeking to shift the burden of the crisis and of the arms race onto the shoulders of the young liberated countries.

The arms race is not only a heavy burden on the shoulders of the working people of capitalist countries, but also has particularly onerous consequences for the peoples of young liberated countries which have only recently embarked on the path of autonomous development. In 1982, $650 billion were spent for these purposes. The Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed limiting the arms race and directing part of the resources saved to developing the states of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. However, all Soviet proposals are blocked by the United States and other NATO members.

Although considerable changes have taken place in the world during the last decades, the United States and other Western powers adhere to the economic order which existed at the end of the last century and the beginning of this one. By means of unequal exchange, raising the interest rate on lonas and credit, and monopolistic pillaging of national resources they annually extort tens of billions of dollars from the developing countries.

As a result of this, the debt of the developing countries has increased catastrophically. From 1971 through 1982 it rose to $626 billion. Many developing countries have found themselves virtually on the brink of economic and financial ruin. And it is not surprising that this problem will occupy a central place at UNCTAD's forthcoming session.

The Soviet Union and other socialist states -- countries with a planned economy -- are objectively interested in transforming international economic relations onto a just democratic basis and creating an economic order in the world which would help strengthen the national economies of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and would also prevent the pumping out of financial resources to the benefit of developed capitalist countries.

The socialist countries firmly support the efforts of the young liberated states which are seeking to stabilize prices for their goods, create and strengthen their scientific and technical potential, and extend the construction of national industrial enterprises which could become the basis for developing an independent economy. They advocate the transfer of technology within the UNCTAD framework so that it is used by all groups of countries without discrimination on political grounds.

This policy stems from the principled stand of the USSR and all the socialist countries on questions of reorganizing international economic relations on a democratic and equal basis and from their course of developing mutually beneficial economic, scientific, and technical cooperation with young liberated states and offering them practical assistance in overcoming economic backwardness.

The forthcoming UNCTAD session promises to be the most important international forum of the eighties at which topical questions of improving international economic relations will be examined. The session's success will greatly depend on the political maturity, realism, and good will of all its participants.

Text of Government Message

PM090922 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 83 First Edition p 1

[Text] To the Chairman of the Sixth Session of UNCTAD, Belgrade:

The USSR Council of Ministers cordially greets the participants in the Sixth UNCTAD Session.

The current UNCTAD session is meeting in a seriously aggravated international situation. The forces hostile to peace, detente, and international cooperation have set course toward whipping up international tension and have launched a dangerous arms race, above all a nuclear arms race, on an unprecedented sale. The enormous military spending is proving an increasingly heavy burden for the peoples and is slowing down economic and social progress.

The development of international cooperation is currently coming up against increasing difficulties. The opponents of a radical restructuring of the unequal economic relations engendered by imperialism have for several years now blocked the opening of global talks on very important economic problems. In their search for a way out of the deep crisis they are shifting its burden onto the shoulders of their peoples and the peoples of developing countries, erecting obstacles in the path of normal economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, resorting to discriminatory measures, and using economic ties as an instrument of exploitation, political pressure, and interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

In these conditions UNCTAD's role and importance as an organ which is called upon to promote the development of mutually advantageous trade and economic relations between all states on a long-term basis, the strengthening of confidence in international economic relations, and the creation of conditions for the developing countries' accelerated economic growth is increasing.

The Soviet Union's principled approach to the problems within UNCTAD's sphere of competence is well known. It is reflected in the Political Declaration adopted by the socialist countries in Prague in January 1983 in which they again express themselves in favor of restructuring the international economic relations on a just and democratic basis, establishing of a new international economic order, and ensuring the Asian, African, Latin American and Oceanian countries' full sovereignty over their natural resources.

Rendering aid and assistance to developing countries in their struggle to overcome economic backwardness is one of our state's fundamental policies and this was reaffirmed at the 37th UN General Assembly Session. The USSR intends to continue to develop mutually advantageous equitable trade, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation with those developing countries which are interested in this.

World economic development and cooperation prospects depend on the peace-loving forces' success in implementing the main goal of the UN Charter -- to rid future generations of the horror and hardships of war, to preserve and strengthen peace. There is no more important task now and the world community must channel all its efforts into its solution.

We wish the participants in the Sixth UNCTAD Session successful work for the welfare of peace and progress.

[Signed] USSR Council of Ministers

'Imperialist' vs. Socialist Approach

LD091515 Moscow World Service in English 2030 GMT 8 Jun 83

[Text] The UN Conference on Trade and Development continues its session in Belgrade. About 3,000 experts, ministers and political leaders from 160 countries, which is actually all the countries represented at the United Nations Organization, are attending this session. The representative character of the meeting is easy to explain, our commentator Georgiy Tanov says. At its session the UN Conference on Trade and Development considers economic, trade and currency financial problems, that is matters of direct concern to hundreds of millions of people.

The Belgrade conference is only in the beginning of its nearly 1 month session, yet it is already plain to see that just as the previous sessions the position of the overwhelming majority of developing countries either comes close to or coincides with the position of the socialist countries, while sharply differing from the approach of the leading imperialist powers. This factor vividly manifested itself again at the recent meeting of the Big Seven in Williamsburg.

Leaders of the major imperialist pool, with the United States at the head, refused to -- and for that matter couldn't offer any concrete measures -- to invigorate the international economic climate, to assist developing countries, their former colonies and dependent territories. On the contrary, as for example a number of African papers underlined, the conference in Williamsburg served as a springboard for intensifying by the West its corrective pressure on the developing countries.

As the developments in the South of Africa, in some of the regions of eastern Africa, in Zaire and Chad and also at the 19th assembly of the OAU show, this pressure is more and more often accompanied by political and at times purely military maneuvers on the part of the NATO powers, the United States above all. Imperialism carries not only inflation, crisis phenomenon and the bondage of debts onto African soil but also a minirace in armaments, an atmosphere of mistrust, disunity and conflict.

The socialist countries have arrived at the UN Conference on Trade and Development with a different approach. In its report to the current session the UN Conference on Trade and Development Secretariat says that the socialist countries pursue their policy of intensive expansion of trade and economic cooperation founded on equality, mutual advantage and support of developing countries to strengthen their economic independence. The document backs these words with facts: With assistance from the European socialist countries, members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, by 1982 over 6.4 thousand production facilities have been built, were under construction or in the blueprint stage in the developing countries. Eighty percent of these were factories and power stations. This year, the developing countries in the trade turnover of the socialist countries have reached 20 percent.

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development Secretariat draws special attention to the favorable terms of aid from the socialist countries, their preparedness to share latest technology with the developing countries, and also to their obvious services in training tens of thousands of specialists and hundreds of thousands of skilled workers who are among citizens of the developing countries. With the help of the Soviet Union alone, and only in Africa, more than half of about 600 projects, factories, power stations, plantations, schools and so on, have already been built. The USSR never had, and does not have, colonies. It is not responsible either economically or morally for the historical backwardness of the developing countries. Nonetheless, it allocates more than 1 percent of its national production, or billions of roubles, as aid to the developing countries. This policy is not dictated by any considerations of a given moment, it is genuinely socialist, comradely internationalist policy.

The present UN Conference on Trade and Development session in Belgrade is working on the background of a dangerous worsening in the international situation. And again, writes the commentator Georgiy Tanov, I cannot help mentioning the meeting in Williamsburg where the imperialist Big Seven in fact reaffirmed their militaristic strategy of (?deterrent) towards the socialist and progressive developing countries. This strategy, fed on Washington's imperial ambitions, actually brings to nought any serious intentions in the field of rebuilding international economic relations on a democratic, fair basis. It makes unrealistic cuts in military expenditure or the use of some of the money thus released for assisting the developing countries.

What's more, as for example THE NEW YORK TIMES admits, the leaders of the major NATO countries and of Japan that met in Williamsburg saw one of their key aims in paralyzing the world movement of peaceful forces. It's easy to see what importance in this context assumes the conviction of the Soviet Union, as formulated in its government's message to the session, that the prospects of world economic development and cooperation directly depend on achievements of peaceful forces in solving the primary task of humanity, which is to deliver us from the hardships and horrors of war.

'PEACE THROUGH FORCE' TRIUMPHS AT WILLIAMSBURG

LD092135 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0445 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Here is the latest broadcast in the series "Topical Problems of International Life."

It is devoted to the results of the conference in the American town of Williamsburg of the leaders of the seven major capitalist states. At the microphone is the author, international affairs journalist Gennadiy Gerasimov.

[Gerasimov] Hello, comrades. This was the ninth such meeting of the leaders of the seven major western countries: the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan and Canada. These meetings have been held annually since 1975, the time of the first oil crisis when rising world oil prices jeopardized the normal functioning of the whole capitalist economy.

Following tradition, the meeting of the Seven was to discuss problems of the world capitalist economy. Six of these can be singled out. The first problem, probably the chief one, is unemployment. On the eve of the meeting, in a statement on his arrival in Williamsburg, U.S. President Ronald Reagan spoke of the 22 million unemployed in the countries participating in the meeting. A larger figure, by the way, is cited by others. U.S. Treasury Secretary Donald Regan spoke of unemployment as the main problem. Two other major ills, namely the rate of inflation and interest rates, diminished in comparison with the previous meeting last year in Versailles, France.

So, the problem of unemployment was given central place. This is what Allen Wallis, U.S. under secretary of state and the President's personal spokesman at the conference, wrote on the eve of the meeting: I was asked to sum up the significance of the forthcoming conference in one word. I said: Jobs. And, indeed, the final assessment of the economic policies now being pursued will depend on whether they create jobs. That is how things were before the conference.

And after? In fact, the theme of unemployment was not seriously discussed at the conference. In the final economic declaration the participants limited themselves to expressing the general desire to reduce the level of unemployment. They relied on the free market to solve the problem of them. So, nothing was done on the main issue.

The second problem: Currencies. The exchange rates of the Seven's currencies in relation to each other have recently become extremely unstable, hindering the normal course of trade and encouraging speculation. Such instability prevents long-term planning of international trade and investment. Particularly harmful is the influence of the high rate of the U.S. dollar. According to figures from the Institute of World Economics in Washington, the rate of the dollar is roughly 20 percent too high. This makes American exports more expensive and pushes up interest rates. On the other hand, the rate of the Japanese yen is considered too low, which leads to a growth in exports of high-quality and relatively cheap Japanese goods and encourages the partners to react defensively by turning to protectionism. President Reagan considers that all this will sort itself out on its own. Again, the same faith that the free market will come up with something, faith in pure capitalism. Nevertheless, he made a concession at the conference to President Francois Mitterrand of France and agreed to include a clause in the economic declaration to the effect that the question of the role in improving the international currency system of a high-level international monetary conference should be studied in due course. Observers view this formulation as an extremely vague promise.

The next, third point on the agenda: the U.S. budget deficit. That deficit is enormous and is continuing to grow, presenting a serious obstacle on the way to emerging from the present economic crisis. This is because it swallows up savings, intensifies competition for credits and ensures that interest rates remain high. In the view of many, for example the leader of Germany's Social Democratic Party, Willy Brandt, continuing high interest rates in the United States will slow down economic recovery in Europe. Expensive credits prevent new companies from being set up and new businesses being started.

In Williamsburg, Reagan did not in the end say what he intends to do to reduce his budget deficit, nor even did he promise to do so. After all, one of the main ways of reducing that deficit is to bring down military spending. But military spending for Washington is a sacred cow and cannot be touched.

The next point, the fourth: trade protectionism. Despite arguing for adherence to free trade, the countries taking part in the Williamsburg meeting are practising protectionism. For example, in an interview on the eve of the conference President Reagan declared: I am against protectionism. That topic will be discussed at the summit. At the same time, the United States itself is restricting imports of textiles, beef, sugar, steel, motorcycles and is putting pressure on Japan to restrict its exports to the United States of cars, color televisions, and so on. On this issue, the economic declaration contains a commitment by the participants in the meeting to stop applying protectionism and, as long as the economic recovery continues, reverse the trend toward protectionism by lifting trade barriers. The reservation about economic recovery weakens the importance of the whole commitment, and, in the opinion of Willy Brandt, whom I have already mentioned, the declaration against protectionism threatens to be an empty promise because of unemployment.

The next, fifth point: the indebtedness of the developing countries. The protracted crisis of the world's capitalist economy, accompanied by a drop in prices for export produce from the developing countries against a background of high interest rates, has caused serious financial difficulties in these countries, particularly in Latin America. The debt of the developing countries has now reached a level ten times higher than 10 years ago. The attention of the participants in the meeting was drawn to the fate of the developing countries by the UN Secretary General in a special letter to them. On this important topic the final economic declaration has only dead phrases about more open markets and global economic recovery. It is suggested, that before things get better for the developing countries, things must get better for the developed ones.

The next, sixth point: East-West trade. In the course of several weeks before Williamsburg the American press carried many articles on Washington's plan to impose on its partners much greater restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union and its allies than at present. These partners raised serious objections at various levels. Western Europe, to a much greater extent than the United States, is interested in expanding trade exchanges with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Moreover, Western Europe is not inclined to view relations with the Soviet Union as a struggle against evil, not to agree entirely with Reagan's anti-Soviet fanaticism. At the end of the day, at the meeting itself, this potentially dangerous issue for Reagan was in essence not discussed. It is written in the economic declaration, that economic relations between East and West should comply with our interests in the area of security, a formulation which lets the United States go back to the issue later.

Apparently, the point is that at the Williamsburg meeting the United States set itself a more radical task, to create a unified anti-Soviet military-political front in the West. The American side put before the participants, the draft text of a statement set out in very strong language. As a result, from the very outset, a traditional economic summit meeting was turned into a military-political one. On the eve of its opening, a Soviet Government statement was published with a call to return to the path of political and military detente together with a warning that, because of the further spiralling of the strategic arms race, the Soviet Union is faced with the need to take retaliatory measures to strengthen its defense capability. The deployment of new American missiles in Europe, the statement says, will force the Soviet Union to reconsider its decision on a a unilateral moratorium on the further deployment of medium-range weapons in the European zone.

Moreover, it will also be necessary, and the Soviet side has repeatedly warned of this, to take essential retaliatory measures with regard to the territory of the United States itself. But, instead of taking heed of this warning, Washington made use of the publication of the Soviet Government statement to cobble together an anti-Soviet front. A political declaration was adopted at Williamsburg in support of the siting in Western Europe of a new generation of American nuclear missiles. The original draft was somewhat softened after 24 hours of arguing, it was reported. Nevertheless, it can be seen as a victory for Reagan's tough line on the Soviet Union.

In the opinion of American observer Joseph Kraft, the Williamsburg conference may be the point of departure for a coordinated approach toward the Soviet Union. The communique itself, talks of the planned deployment of U.S. nuclear systems in Europe if, at the talks in Geneva, no accord is reached on levels of deployment, that is, the American interim option. The communique is silent about the Soviet proposals and declares that the security of the West is indivisible and that it has to be approached on a global basis. In this connection, the signatures of France and Japan at the bottom of the communique should be noted. France is not part of the NATO military organization but it is now in full solidarity with its plans, surprising itself in this, it is said. At any rate, President Francois Mitterrand, preparing to leave for the United States, said that no political declaration was planned. Japan is not part of NATO at all. Now it has become a sort of unofficial member of this aggressive bloc.

The chief outcome of the Williamsburg conference is a political one. It consists in a move to consolidate the capitalist countries on an anti-Soviet basis under American leadership.

But the result of the conference in the economic sphere is virtually nil. On the eve of the conference, Alan Greenspan, the President's economic adviser, warned against unwarranted hopes and the sudden discovery of some kind of magic elixir that will put the world economy back on its feet. Indeed, where would that elixir come from? And after the conference, observer Geyelin said in THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper that all meetings of the Seven have in general become an annual medical checkup rather than a serious attempt to cure the obvious ills from which the industrialized West is suffering.

After Williamsburg a tendency appeared in the American press to change the image of the President from an incompetent cowboy to a skilled player and wise leader. The reasons for the attempts to create a more attractive image for Reagan evidently have to do with the approach of a new presidential election campaign in the United States and the above-mentioned policy of consolidating the West under American leadership. The President himself, has started talking more frequently about peace and how terrible war is. He has not, however, abandoned any of his military programs and, after Williamsburg, he joyfully declared on the radio that the idea of peace through force had triumphed there. And that, after all, is the well-known formula for the arms race.

The Soviet Union continues to call for reason and common sense. In the present international conditions, considering both the overall strategic situation and the growing number of explosive problems in the world, the Soviet Union and the United States cannot permit themselves to be oriented toward military rivalry. This is what Comrade Andropov said on 2 June in conversation with Averell Harriman and his wife Pamela. Harriman, as is known, was U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union during the war, and for many years he has been advocating the normalization of U.S.-Soviet relations. Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov stressed that today the Soviet people and the Americans have a common enemy, the threat of war, incomparable in its destructive consequences with anything that has gone before. Awareness of that danger should promote mutual restraint. Unfortunately, that kind of responsible approach on the part of the present U.S. Administration is not visible, as was shown once again by the conference in Williamsburg.

NONALIGNED SUMMIT REVIEWED FOR SOVIET PUBLIC

LD090112 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 8 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS -- The Soviet people totally support the calls by the New Delhi nonaligned forum for putting an end to the arms race, above all of nuclear arms, for prohibiting all nuclear weapons tests and freezing nuclear weapons arsenals, said Vitaliy Ruben, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He was addressing today a meeting of representatives of Soviet public in Moscow devoted to the Seventh Nonaligned Summit conference in New Delhi.

These calls, Vitaliy Ruben continued, are going in the same direction as the USSR's peace proposals directed at implementing real steps in the field of disarmament, until complete and general disarmament.

The Soviet Union, he went on to say, fully shares the opinion of the nonaligned countries that states possessing nuclear weapons should observe the existing agreements on the limitation of arms and hold talks more vigorously for the adoption of effective programmes for complete and general disarmament.

Vitaliy Ruben recalled the repeated statements by the Soviet Government on the readiness to reach agreement any time on a mutual basis on a freeze on the nuclear arsenals of the USSR and the USA as the first step towards their reduction and, in the long run, their total scrapping. But the USA does not accept such an agreement, he stressed.

The Soviet Union, Vitaliy Ruben said, opposes the partitioning of the world into military-political blocs. The proposals on the disbandment of both military political alliances, and as the first step -- liquidating the military organizations, which were repeatedly put forward by the Warsaw Treaty member-states, fully remain in force. Also well known are the statements by the participants in the Warsaw Treaty that they do not intend to widen the sphere of actions of their alliance to other areas of the world, for which they persistently urge also NATO.

The chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Soviet parliament declared the Soviet Union's solidarity with the Nonaligned Movement which has condemned the aggressive policy of the USA and its allies in the Middle East, in southern Africa, Central America and other regions.

The Soviet Union, he continued, supports the demand of the nonaligned states for dismantling foreign military bases in the Indian Ocean and turning it into a zone of peace. It also treats with understanding the determination of the nonaligned states to step up the struggle for a restructuring of international economic relations on the basis of justice and equality.

Vitaliy Ruben stressed that the significance of the New Delhi forum is particularly obvious against the background of the present-day alarming situation in the world, which is notable for a growth of the aggressiveness and hegemonistic ambitions of U.S. imperialism, its neo-colonialist objectives in the Middle and Near East, in Central America, in the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins, and other parts of the world. The New Delhi forum laid special emphasis on the task of preventing a nuclear catastrophe.

U.S. SAID 'SABOTAGING' PROSPECT OF CW BAN

PM092000 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 83 First Edition p 4

[A. Petrov article: "Chemical Weapons and the Washington Alchemists"]

[Text] After announcing a 'crusade" against communism, Washington has adopted a broad military program designed to ensure U.S. military superiority over the Soviet Union. The main "trump card" of this program is the new types of nuclear missiles. At the same time an important place in the program is assigned to preparations for chemical warfare. It is often stressed in the U.S. capital that chemical weapons have the feature of destroying people while leaving material assets untouched. Is that not the dream of an aggressor who wants to seize foreign territories and other wealth? From this viewpoint chemical warfare means can be ranked with neutron weapons. However, in the opinion of Pentagon specialists, they are not mutually exclusive. Contemporary American military doctrine presupposes the comprehensive utilization of all means of warfare, each of which is to complement the others by virtue of its particular features.

At the present time the United States has the world's largest arsenal of chemical weapons. According to the estimates of foreign specialists, stocks of these weapons in the United States total more than 150,000 tons, and the quantity of ammunition is about 3 million rounds.

But even this seems inadequate to Washington. Early last year President Reagan announced a decision to embark on a program of chemical rearmament. Up to $10 billion is to be spent on implementing it. The aim of the program is to update and enlarge the American arsenal of chemical weapons. The program envisages the mass production of new types of chemical weapons, the rehearsal of methods of using them, and the construction of storage bases outside the country. It is planned to increase stocks of chemical munitions to 5 million rounds.

The main element in the American program of chemical rearmament is the creation of binary weapons. From the technical viewpoint these differ from conventional weapons in that they consist of two components (chemicals). As a binary charge is delivered to the target its two components react together chemically, and as a result a highly toxic substance designed to destroy the enemy is formed. Since the actual components of binary weapons are not as toxic as the end product of their reaction, their production and transportation to the place where the ammunition is filled are relatively safe.

Thus in creating binary weapons the United States intends to make its territory as safe as possible from the chance of chemical contamination as a result of accidents or malfunctions. The processes of filling the ammunition with the binary components, delivery to army depots, storage, and deployment in combat positions are far more dangerous. During these stages binary ammunition represents a real danger to people. But it is precisely these stages, according to Washington's scheme, that are to be carried out on the territory not of the United States, but of its allies, particularly the West European allies.

In the American plans Europe is assigned the role of future battlefield. After all, it is this densely populated continent that has been chosen by Washington as the main theater for the utilization of neutron weapons too. It is planned to deploy American nuclear first-strike weapons -- the new medium-range missiles -- there, closer to the USSR's borders. And it is there, too, that the American chemical weapons are being deployed.

Thus even in peacetime West Europe is being subjected to the threat of chemical contamination as a result of an accidental leak during storage, to say nothing of the fact that it is becoming the Pentagon's hostage in both nuclear war and war using chemical weapons.

Naturally, these U.S. actions are prompting resolute protests in the West European countries. Running up against these protests, the American Administration is trying to suggest to West European public opinion that it is interested in prohibiting chemical weapons and is ready to reach an appropriate international accord.

Having proclaimed so-called "public diplomacy," which is designed to provide propaganda camouflage for war preparations, official Washington, in order to pursue it, has borrowed from the advertising agencies of New York's Madison Avenue their cheapest methods of selling worthless products. Washington diplomats are now trying to market yet another poor-quality commodity -- the U.S. stance on chemical weapons. An obstrusive theme of official American spokesmen's statements is the proclamation of the need to prohibit and destroy chemical weapons.

As recently as 30 May the leaders of seven capitalist countries, the United States included, who gathered in Williamsburg declared that the Western side has put forward proposals "with the aim of achieving positive results," including on the question of prohibiting chemical weapons.

What, in fact, is the U.S. stance regarding this truly vital problem?

Refusing to continue the bilateral Soviet-American talks, broken off by the American side in 1980, the United States is now opposing in the Disarmament Committee the complete prohibition [zapreshcheniye v polnom obeme] of chemical weapons, including the types that it used extensively during the aggression in Vietnam. It is covering up its refusal to exclude chemical weapons from states' arsenals by making deliberately unacceptable absurd demands regarding control issues.

The question of prohibiting chemical weapons has been under study in the Disarmament Committee since early 1970. In the past 13 years the majority of the states taking part in the committee's work have set out their views in detail. They have submitted about 300 documents thoroughly analyzing the technical, military, juridical, and other aspects of the problem.

Last year the Soviet Union put forward a draft "Basic Provisions of a Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction." This document, which is now under consideration by the committee, takes into account the results of the Soviet-American talks and also the viewpoints of other states expressed both in the committee itself and in the UN General Assembly. It represents a detailed and well thought out proposal that covers all aspects of the problem of the prohibition of chemical weapons. In particular, it envisages international control measures including onsite checks on compliance with the future convention. According to the Soviet proposal, if suspicions arise that there has been a violation of the convention by any participating state, international inspections can be carried out on its territory -- with its consent.

In addition, the Soviet Union is proposing that the destruction of stockpiles be checked by means of systematic compulsory inspections (within the framework of a quota to be agreed). The production of supertoxic lethal chemicals, which the participating states will be allowed to engage in, within insignificant limits, for purposes unconnected with the creation of chemical weapons (in medicine, scientific research, and so forth), must be monitored in the same way.

If the United States wanted not just in words but in reality to conclude a convention, it would not be all that difficult to reach an agreement, especially as the Soviet proposals include elements with which U.S. representatives have already agreed during the bilateral talks. However, what Washington needs is not agreement, but merely a screen for the continued buildup of its arsenals of chemical weapons.

Demagoguery alone clearly does not provide propaganda camouflage to the U.S. liking. So myths are appearing about cases of the alleged use of Soviet-produced chemical weapons in Afghanistan and in Southeast Asia. In order to bolster its slanderous fabrications, the United States managed to get a group of expert chemists set up in the United Nations in 1980. But this group, after 2 years' work, reached the conclusion that it was impossible to confirm the fabricated reports of cases of the use of these weapons. Neither direct pressure on the experts nor the attempts by the U.S. special services to plant specially prepared "witnesses" on them were any help. Moreover, even the U.S. allies, saving face, have now been forced to disown this forgery that was crudely produced in Washington.

A recently published Australian Defense Ministry report openly says that no substantial toxicity has been detected in the samples of "poisoned" leaves obtained from Laos, and the samples themselves are a "fake." And even prominent U.S. and British scientists, in a report presented to the annual (1983) conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, reached the conclusion that the "samples" collected by the U.S. State Department, which are supposed to be evidence of the use of chemical weapons in Southeast Asia, have nothing to do with any weapons whatever.

Broad circles of the world public viewed with the utmost seriousness two critical analyses of the American slander prepared in 1982-83 by Soviet experts from the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Ministry of Health, and other competent Soviet organizations and published as offical UN documents. Using specific, scientifically substantiated data, these reveal the falsity of the American "arguments."

No endeavors by American propaganda can conceal the generally known fact that the Soviet Union has never used chemical weapons and has never supplied them to anyone. It has always consistently advocated and continues to advocate that no place be left on earth for means of chemical warfare. While demanding that they be outlawed on a global scale, the USSR, in conjunction with the other Warsaw Pact states, has also put forward the proposal for a regional solution of this question, for Europe in particular. The elimination from this continent of chemical weapons would be an important stage along the road to solving the question of their complete prohibition on a worldwide scale.

The propaganda clamor launched by Washington about the imagined use of Soviet-produced chemical weapons also pursues another aim -- to make people forget the real facts of the use of chemical weapons by the U.S. Army in Vietnam in the sixties and early seventies. The international symposium held in Ho Chi Minh City in January 1983 revealed incontrovertible proof that the United States waged large-scale chemical warfare in Vietnam over a huge area and for a long time. The symposium in Ho Chi Minh City, in which more than 160 scientists and specialists from 21 countries, the United States included, and also observers from a number of international organizations took part, reached the conclusion that this was the first instance in history of such massive use of chemical weapons. Bloodcurdling facts about the genetic and ecological consequences of the use of chemical weapons in Vietnam by the United States were quoted during the symposium. Congenital deformities in children and the transformation of once fertile areas into areas unsuitable for habitation -- such are the consequences of this criminal adventure.

In the fall of 1982 the United States, along with its allies, launched a maneuver designed to remove the existing barriers to the chemical threat. They created a clamor with the aim of undermining the 1925 Geneva Protocol prohibiting the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons on the pretext of creating a control mechanism, although many states that are party to the Geneva Protocol opposed this. This dangerous venture bore a hallmark characteristic of Washington's diplomacy. It took the United States half a century to become a party to the Geneva Protocol -- it ratified it only in 1975, under pressure from other states. However, the U.S. accession to the protocol essentially did not change the country's negative attitude toward this important international document. When ratifying the protocol it made provisos aimed at undermining it. According to these, the United States unilaterally arrogated to itself the right -- contrary to the spirit and the letter of the document -- to use a whole series of chemical toxins under certain circumstances. The new sabotage against the Geneva Protocol and the attempt to undermine it from within are also dangerous because they may damage the entire existing system of international agreements in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament.

Lined up together, the fact about the U.S. approach to the problem of prohibiting chemical weapons show conclusively that Washington is sabotaging the formulation of a convention on prohibiting and destroying chemical weapons and is steering a line toward undermining what has already been accomplished in this sphere. These actions in no way tally with U.S. spokesmen's statements on the question of prohibiting chemical weapons.

Just as medieval alchemists sought ways of transforming base metals into gold, the Washington alchemists are now trying to portray the black U.S. position as white. It is well known that the alchemists were never able to learn how to transform rusty iron into gold. The swindling tricks to which they resorted in order to fool trusting people were not successful either. The same fate lies in store for their present-day disciples in Washington.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA VIEWS U.S. NAVAL STRATEGY

PM090922 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Jun 83 First Edition p 5

[Candidate of Military Sciences N. Shaskolskiy article based on "foreign press materials": "The Pentagon's Ocean Strategy"]

[Text] Since the Republican administration came to power, people in Washington have started frequently recalling ideas typical of the U.S. federal laedership in times past. Let us recall that President Reagan, speaking on board the battleship "New Jersey", festively decorated to mark its return to the active Navy, quoted Theodore Roosevelt's sentence: "The Navy is the right hand of the United States." These words, spoken at the beginning of the century by the author of the U.S. policy of the "big stick," are obviously to the liking of the present White House chief. However, 80 years ago the U.S. President wielded his stick basically in the Western Hemisphere, while the present one is brandishing it at the whole world. That is just what he said in his speech: It is apparently necessary to "gain access to all the oceans of the world and to control the airspace above them, their surface, and their depths."

This time, this is not an ambitious phrase that has casually slipped out. As the U.S. press notes, Reagan is a firm champion of a global strategy in which Naval forces play an important role. The creators of this strategy consider that the Navy, more than any other branch of the Armed Forces, is best suited to implement the ideas of "global deterrence" and "protection of vital U.S. interests" throughout the world. Having a powerful Navy, they consider, makes you feel the neighbor of any coastal state, since the seas afford the opportunity to send naval units freely to even the most isolated regions.

As U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger declared in Congress, the first task of the administration's naval program is to increase the Navy's offensive might. This is basically being accomplished by arming the ships with long-range, highly accurate missile weapons.

In particular, the Tomahawk cruise missile, with a range of 2,500 km, are meant to destroy small defended targets deep within enemy territory and are to be deployed on 100 surface ships and submarines.

The first surface ship with 32 Tomahawk launchers -- the aforementioned battleship "New Jersey" -- is ready to sail. It is because of these missiles that U.S. Navy Secretary Lehman called that giant, built 40 years ago and encased in heavy armor, "the most modern ship in the world." In the meantime the Tomahawks are stored in containers on the deck, where they take up much space. But a special compact installation has already been developed, consisting of vertical shafts, which can be installed on ships of medium and low displacement.

The 55 hunger-killer submarines will carry 12 Tomahawks each instead of some of their spare torpedoes (they can be launched via the torpedo tubes). These submarines, which are currently being built, will carry the missiles in 30 hermetically sealed vertical containers situated outside the solid body, and their launchers will be used for torpedoes. There are also plans to install cruise missiles in the holds of some missile-carrying atomic submarines built in the early sixties and previously [equipped] with the Polaris ballistic missiles. The submarines with nuclear cruise missiles will join the strategic forces reserve.

It is planned to install, in all, some 2,600 ship-based launchers for Tomahawk missiles in the eighties. Special attention during the deployment of this new offensive weapon will be given to the dispersal of nuclear missiles among the largest possible number of carriers and in the greatest number of sea areas so as to hinder the enemy's defense against sea-launched attack.

The second task of the program is to raise the fleet's daily readiness for action. According to the views of people in the Pentagon, 25-30 percent of ships from the general purpose forces must be constantly on the frontline in regions distant from the United States. The task is being resolved by raising the level of self-sufficiency and increasing the reserves of consumables and fuel at forward bases; within 5 years the number of mobile rear supply ships will increase 20 percent. But higher readiness demands will be also made on the remaining ships. They are being given the status of "deployment-ready combat forces." For the development of means of sea transport for military freight and troops over the next 5 years, $6 billion has been allocated -- 25 percent more than for the same period in the past.

The third task is to increase substantially the efficiency of antiair and antisubmarine defenses. At the new stage this task is also planned to be resolved in an offensive spirit. Thus, in the planning of antiair defense, preference is given to operations to destroy the aircraft along their flight path and on the ground before they reach the missile launch range.

Navy Secretary Lehman himself has clearly formulated the new approach toward the waging of antisubmarine warfare in his speeches. Thus, he described as "a losing defense strategy" even the "antisubmarine frontier," created by his predecessors along the Greenland-Iceland-Great Britain line, along which NATO's surface ships, submarines, aircraft, and fixed underwater facilities have been assigned the task of "blocking" the Soviet fleet's entry into the Atlantic. "You must have your own forces to the north of this frontier," Lehman lectures his admirals, "in the Norwegian and Barents Seas, so that we do not have to defend the approaches to the Atlantic Ocean but the Soviet fleet has to defend its exits from bases."

The implementation of the above-mentioned tasks is supported materially by a sharp increase in the numbers of ships -- in 5 years it is planned to finance the building of 150 ships and also to procure about 1,400 aircraft for the Navy's air arm.

In essence the program of increasing the U.S. Navy's combat might, just as the Pentagon's entire ocean strategy, is meant to support Washington's imperial claims and its global policy, aimed at establishing total world domination. For camouflage purposes, the new naval arms race is taking place under cover of fabrications about the "Soviet military threat" at sea and the "defensive" character of U.S. strategy. What Reagan's administration understands by "Soviet military threat" and "defense" was well explained by General Jones, until recently chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Trying to convince members of Congress of the allegedly "low" level of the U.S. Armed Forces, he criticized those who, in his words, approach "in an oversimplified way" their comparison with the USSR's Armed Forces. "We have a much more difficult job than the enemy," said the general, explaining the crux of the matter, "because we will have to engage in combat actions in regions distant from the United States and only some 100 miles from the Soviet Union's borders." (!) Given such an approach, it is understandable why even the 15 aircraft carrier formations (this is exactly how many the Pentagon plans to have in action) are considered the bare minimum necessary. As THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote, according to the Pentagon's calculations it will need 22 aircraft carrier formations for the effective implementation of such "defense" tasks!

Navy Secretary Lehman, leading proponent of the strategy of "forward sea defense," explains that its main purpose is to isolate the USSR from the rest of the world, right up to blocking its internal sea communications. For this purpose he calls for maximum utilization of the well known advantages offered by the geographic situation of the United States and its allies in relation to the USSR. The overall meaning of this phraseology about "defense" is known to our readers from the extracts, published by the press, of the Pentagon's directives for fiscal 1984-88 and 1985-89. These documents lay out fully for the first time the U.S. military concept. Furthermore, they set as the main task "the destruction of socialism as a sociopolitical system."

THE NEW YORK TIMES described the decision to step up the program for deploying the new sea-based Trident II ICBM's as an "Embellishment" on the Pentagon directives. These missiles are due to be installed on Ohio-class submarines a year earlier than the previously set time limit -- as early as 1988. In order to speed up the growth of conventional weapons, it is proposed to increase the procurement of standardized weapons and build up reserves for the waging of prolonged hostilities giving them priority over expenditure on new developments. This is the policy which is already being implemented in naval programs.

According to reports published in the foreign press, the U.S. Navy is currently giving special attention to the Near East and the Indian Ocean, where a mass transfer of aircraft carrier groups is planned "in the event of armed conflict." As regards the western Pacific, the basic targets for an aggressive attack are the Soviet Far East coast and, mainly, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy and the Kurile Islands.

Addressing Congress, Lehman said: "We need unconditional superiority over the Soviet Navy; this is a task which should not even be subject of discussion." This is not simply a new strategic task; it is a main national goal without the attainment of which there cannot be any U.S. strategy at all, claims the man who is called the most zealous champion of the President's military policy.

ARTICLE ON 'REAGANISM AND OUTSIDE WORLD' CITED

LD100315 Moscow TASS in English 2253 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS -- When trying to find out the origins of the general approach of Reagan's conservative government to the outside world it is necessary to

take into consideration the fact that this approach in the main reflects the aspirations of that group of the Republican Party which was kept from power for more than 20 years and which, remaining on the periphery of the political life in the USA, has preserved more or less intact the traditions and leftovers of the cold war, straightforward anti-communism of the time of John Dulles based on the myth about the existence of a "world communist conspiracy masterminded by Moscow", Yuriy Davydov writes in the latest issue of the journal USA -- ECONOMY, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY.

In the article entitled "The Approach of the Reagan Administration to the Outside World" Davydov writes that another specific feature of the present U.S. Administration is that the President and his closest assistants, in the nature of their previous activity, had little connections with the foreign policy practice of the USA.

The present Washington administration is inclined to view international relations above all as an arena for the unrestrained rivalry with other states for hegemony, for the right to influence the development of the world in a decisive way. At the same time it is being asserted that this struggle is allegedly conducted not for the purpose of rebuilding the world on the U.S. pattern, but for the United States' "survival". Objectively such an orientation at the spontaneity of the international relations rejects both theoretically and practically the concept of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems (the concept proceeding from the possibility of creating a structure of international relations based on mutually advantageous cooperation between these systems). Moreover, such an orientation is actively hostile to this concept since it denies equality of states, legalizes their subdivision into weak and strong, and frustrates the process of decolonization of international relations.

Seeking to involve the entire international community into the confrontation in the world arena, the Reagan administration hopes that this process, distracting states from the solution of vital problems, will make it possible to undermine the social and economic positions of socialist countries -- the foundation of their influence on the world of today, to arrest the process of the consolidation of political and economic independence of developing countries, to increase their dependence on industrialised West and at the same time to regain the United States' position of an undisputed leader among imperialist countries.

Washington's line at heightening uncontrolled rivalry in the world of today is manifested in a concrete way in a number of directions, the author writes. Washington tried to disrupt the conclusion of the Madrid meeting, holds an obstructionist stand at the Geneva talks with the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitation and reduction and nuclear arms limitation in Europe, at the Vienna talks on forces and armaments reduction in central Europe. U.S. representatives have blocked the talks on nuclear weapon test ban, on questions of sales of conventional armaments to third countries, on questions of anti-satellite weapons, actually disrupted the so-called "North-South" dialogue. The United States refused to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, disrupted the talks on a number of other vital international problems and altogether assumed an extremely destructive stand in the United Nations.

Pointing out that discrepancies and incongruities constantly and inevitably appear in the United States foreign policy as a result, the author concludes that what the international community expects is not the continuation of the confrontation on the world arena leading to the aggravation of tension and threat of nuclear conflict. The international community is interested in constructive cooperation, in the solution of complex problems facing mankind.

POST CLAIM OF IMPROVED U.S.-USSR TIES DISPUTED

PM091551 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jun 83 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Wishing To Distract Attention"]

[Text] Washington, 8 Jun -- Recently a number of articles have appeared in THE WASHINGTON POST which advanced the idea that there has allegedly been an improvement in Soviet-American relations, and that a "businesslike dialogue" is under way between the United States and the USSR which could virtually lead to the relaxation of the world situation and the smoothing of bilateral relations. Here the paper refers to various administration spokesmen.

In reality things are quite different. The White House is strenuously pursuing a course toward extensive war preparations in all directions. And although it is trying through the press to create the impression of an exchange of opinions on individual questions, this is necessary, evidently, in order to calm the public and distract attention from its militarist preparations, which are arousing the profoundest concern.

As distinct from the articles in THE WASHINGTON POST, many American specialists voice major doubts that any agreements are possible at all, given the current stance of the White House. In actual fact the administration is accelerating [forsirovat] the deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe, which directly contradicts the aims of the Geneva talks. The war department's budget has reached the unprecedented level of $260 billion. The latest types of both conventional and nuclear weapons are being developed.

It is perfectly obvious that Washington is gambling on abolishing the established parity and obtaining unilateral advantages for itself. As for THE WASHINGTON POST's attempts to pass off the administration's propagandist inventions as reality, these will decieve no one.

HOUSE ALLOCATION FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SCORED

LD100158 Moscow TASS in Enlgish 2214 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Washington June 10 TASS -- The House Appropriations Committee on Thursday approved a bill on the allocation to the Pentagon of 7.05 billion dollars for military construction in the 1984 financial year.

The appropriation that make up only a small part of the sum of 280.5 billion dollars planned for the Pentagon's budget for the next financial year are meant for the construction in the United States and in various areas of the world of a wide network of military bases and installations in the framework of the United States' so-called programme of "rearming" and the build-up of the U.S. military presence.

EXPLOSION OF NUCLEAR DEVICE IN NEVADA REPORTED

LD100442 Moscow TASS in English 0417 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] New York June 10 TASS -- The U.S. has exploded underground another nuclear device at a Nevada testing range, UPI has reported quoting the U.S. Energy Department. This is the United States' eighth nuclear test this year.

PREPARATIONS FOR PRC ARMY CHANGES REPORTED

LD091611 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1835 GMT 8 Jun 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Valentin Zorin]

[Text] XINHUA has reported that preparations are now underway in Beijing to overhaul the PRC Army's command. Judging by statements made in the Chinese capital, the matter concerns not just individual rearrangements, but a very large-scale operation.

HISTORY OF SOVIET-CHINESE FRIENDSHIP STRESSED

OW010145 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1300 GMT 31 May 83

[(Sunichin) commentary]

[Text] It has been 59 years since the restortion of Soviet-Chinese diplomatic relations. Shortly after the great socialist revolution in Russia in 1917, the new Soviet Government expressed its willingness to establish relations of equality and good-neighborliness with all countries, including China. However, the reactionaries holding power in China at the time refused to normalize Soviet-Chinese relations for a long time in order to please the imperialists. Later, because of the rising international prestige enjoyed by the Soviet Union and the repeated demands made by progressive people in China, the reactionary Beijing government had to disregard the pressure exerted on it by the imperialist powers and agreed to settle the questions concerning the Soviet-Chinese relations.

On 31 May 1924, an agreement on general principles for the settlement of questions between the Soviet Union and China was signed in Beijing. The document stipulated that the two countries would restore their diplomatic relations and that the Soviet Government would give up tsarist Russia's special privileges in China. At that time the Western powers only kept envoys in China, but China and the Soviet Union agreed to exchange ambassadors at the latter's proposal.

The 1924 Soviet-Chinese agreement became an important event in international life. It was the first equal treaty signed between China and a foreign country. It dealt a forceful blow at the unequal treaties imposed on China by the imperialist powers. Therefore, it strengthened the Chinese people's national liberation movement and supported the Chinese national revolutionary forces' struggle against imperialist oppression. At the same time, the 1924 agreement laid down the principle of good-neighborliness, equality, mutual benefit, cooperation and respect for each other's independence and sovereignty for Soviet-Chinese relations. Therefore, it was no accident that the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations evoked a positive response among Chinese at home and abroad.

For instance, BEIJING RIBAO described the signing of the agreement as a happy event and emphasized that China had never signed a better treaty with any other big powers. In his message to the Chinese people, Mr Sun Yat-sen urged the two countries and their peoples to live in harmony.

The Soviet Union subsequently always strived to keep good-neighborly relations with China and friendship with the Chinese people. This sincerity of the Soviet Union was repeatedly verified by the Chinese people at times of crisis. Our country always helped the Chinese people.

It helped them during the hard struggle in the 1920's between the Chinese revolutionary democrats headed by Mr Sun Yat-sen on one side and the imperialists and the Chinese reactionaries serving the imperialists on the other. It helped them during the 1930's and in the early 1940's when the Japanese militarists invaded China in an attempt to turn the Chinese people into slaves of imperialism. It also helped them after the founding of the People's Republic of China, when the United States and other Western powers laid an economic blockade to strangle the Chinese people and launched an armed invasion of China. Chinese leaders said that the 250 large economic projects built by China with Soviet assistance in the 1950's were the backbone of China's industry. It is to be regretted, that the two countries later broke their good-neighborly relations and cooperation, a break that was not caused by any fault on our part.

The Soviet Union has made repeated concrete proposals for complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. In view of the common and fundamental interests of the Soviet and Chinese people and their common aspiration for social and economic progress, we are ready to devote all our energy to peaceful creative work. Everyone remembers the useful experience of Soviet-Chinese cooperation in the early years of the PRC.

In his book, "Southeast Asia in the Year 2000," Philippine President Marcos points out that understanding between the Soviet Union and China conforms to the interests of the developing countries. These countries, including Chinese nationals living there, need a stable political situation in Asia. The normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations is conducive to international detente. The Soviet Union is doing all it can to normalize Soviet-Chinese relations and restore and develop friendship and all-round cooperation with the Chinese people.

FURTHER ON NAKASONE WILLIAMSBURG REMARKS

OW091415 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 8 Jun 83

[Ivan Vladimirov commentary]

[Text] The mass media of various countries, including the Soviet Union and Japan, have continued to comment on the results of the Williamsburg Summit of the Seven advanced capitalist countries. Radio Moscow commentator Ivan Vladimirov has the following comments:

The declaration and statement adopted at the summit, and the remarks made by leaders of the participating nations, point to the acuteness of the issue concerning the deployment of American cruise missiles and Pershing II's in Western Europe. What drew attention at the summit was the approach taken by the U.S. Government in its attempt to force on other countries its obviously anti-Soviet militaristic policy. Under such circumstances the greatest attention was drawn by the approach toward the summit taken by Prime Minister Nakasone, leader of a country that is not a member of the NATO bloc, one which has experienced the disaster of atomic bombs and that has a peace-oriented constitution.

Despite these facts Prime Minister Nakasone volunteered to assume a defender's role of President Reagan's nuclear strategy. It was reported that Prime Minister Nakasone supported -- with greater enthusiasm than the other leaders -- the U.S. plans to deploy new types of missiles in Western Europe and even suggested that the NATO plans be carried out if the INF talks in Geneva should break down. That Prime Minister Nakasone's remarks were rather harsh on several points was a surprise even to those who were quite used to the bellicose speeches of the American President and the British prime minister.

The approach toward the Soviet Union taken by Prime Minister Nakasone at the Williamsburg Summit was downright unfriendly. In fact, the Japanese prime minister suggested that negotiations with the Soviet Union be carried out on the basis of force. This stance was confirmed by Foreign Minister Abe. After the conclusion of the Williamsburg Summit, Foreign Minister Abe stated at a press conference that the Japanese Government was ready to freeze relations with the Soviet Union and that Japan was being forced to take a firm attitude against the Soviet Union.

Such a foreign policy gets no support in Japan. The TOKYO SHIMBUN reported that Prime Minister Nakasone has taken an increasingly "hawkish" position on international issues by following in the wake of U.S. strategy. The ASAHI SHIMBUN maintained that the signing of the summit's political declaration by the Japanese prime minister was an act that actually committed Japan to the NATO strategy. The paper pointed out that such an important step was taken without the Diet's approval and termed the prime minister's statement stressing ties with the NATO bloc as extremely indiscreet.

This undisgused anti-Soviet trend in Japan's diplomacy cannot escape the notice of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union cannot but be surprised at the fact that while voicing hope for speedy accord at the Geneva talks between the Soviet Union and the United States, the Japanese leader has attempted to obstruct any accord at the talks so as to give rise to a new stage in the arms race.

While in the United States, the Japanese leader indicated that Japanese official circles had once again expressed their intent to establish and develop good-neighborly relations of mutual benefit and cooperation with the Soviet Union. However, this cannot but arouse a sense of distrust. Such a double-dealing approach is bound to hamper the development of Soviet-Japanese relations in the future.

U.S. MILITARY INTEREST IN NORTH JAPAN RAPPED

LD101254 Moscow TASS in English 0924 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] Tokyo June 10 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vasiliy Golovnin reports:

General Alexander Weyand, commander of the U.S. land forces in Japan, has arrived in Hokkaido Island with a view to personally inspecting the current large-scale exercises of Japanese troops there. Upon arriving in Hokkaido today, he stated that he intends to inspect the military facilities located there and give an estimate of the combat efficiency of units stationed on the island. Weyand made it clear that discontent is being expressed in Washington with the rate of the build-up of Japan's "Self-Defence Forces" in the island which is situated near the border with the Soviet Union.

Lately U.S. generals began frequenting Japan's north. This is indicative of the strategic importance which the Pentagon attaches to the area. Thus, some time ago an inspection tour there was made by Robert Long, commander of the U.S. Armed Forces in the area of the Pacific and Indian Oceans. He insisted on creating a powerful military complex in the northern part of Japan to counteract a so-called "Soviet threat."

Deliberately omitted is the fact that the most efficient units of the Japanese Armed Forces, including a select armoured division, are already stationed in Hokkaido and in the northern part of Honshu island. The Government of Japan has agreed to a transfer of about 50 "F-16" combat aircraft of the U.S. Air Force to Honshu Island, and has placed the Chitose air base, the biggest one on Hokkaido, at the disposal of the U.S. military.

At present, having received assurances from Tokyo that Washington may rely on Japan as its "unsinkable aircraft carrier," the Pentagon is demanding that the country step up military preparations still more, and first of all in its northern part. General Weyand's arrival in Hokkaido is another confirmation of that.

'DISCONTENT' WITH JAPANESE ECONOMIC POLICIES NOTED

LD091458 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

The steps taken by the Japanese Government to (?dampen) the discontent growing in the United States and West European countries over the expansion of Japanese monopolies into their markets have not brought any desirable results so far. Moreover, to all appearances, fiercer clashes between the three in the trade and economic fields are in the offing after the Williamsburg Summit.

Observers following the foreign policy actions of the Nakasone government have not failed to notice one regular feature of the tactic of the Japanese leaders in relations with their major partners. Both during Nakasone's visit to the United States earlier this year, and during Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe's tour of West European countries, as well as at the recent meeting in Williamsburg, the Japanese vociferously called for stronger "Western solidarity," made far reaching claims about the need for "strategic cooperation" between the NATO countries and Japan, and assumed extensive military and political commitments. In return Tokyo only wanted that it be left alone to continue boosting its exports to those countries and not pressed to increase too dramatically its imports from the United States and Western Europe.

These attempts to alleviate trade and economic differences, which have become quite acute under conditions of recession in the West, gave Japan only a short reprieve, if any, in the years-long trade war with its main partners, but never eliminated the root causes of that war, namely, the antagosistic interests of the monopolies of the United States, Japan, and the Common Market countries. This antagonism is measured not only by the 19 billion dollar deficit of the United States and the 14 billion dollar deficit of the EEC countries in trade with Japan last year. According to Gallup figures, 75 per cent of U.S. businessmen view the "U.S. minor partner" today as a threat to America which they would like to neutralize by all means, to the point of having special legislation adopted by Congress. U.S. Under Commerce Secretary Lionel Olmer warned in a recent interview to the newspaper NIHON KAIZAI that the administration could not ignore Japan's aggressive policy in the American market because it was becoming a factor doing immediate damage to American companies. There are similar sentiments in the Common Market countries.

Japanese monopolies, however, are not going to give up the positions they have won in fierce rivalry on the Western markets. Foreign Trade and Industry Minister Sadanori Yamanaka hinted at a recent press conference that the Japanese Government and, perhaps, Japanese businessmen, were ready to meet the challenge from other countries.

Since the trade imbalance between Japan and the United States remains unchanged, the newspaper ASAHI says, the Japanese Foreign Ministry expects a new flareup of contradictions between Washington and Tokyo. Foreign Ministry top officials say that the condition of relations with the USA at present is even worse than it was on the eve of the Pacific War.

The efforts made by the Nakasone government to demonstrate support for the aggressive plans of the USA and NATO in an attempt to win concessions from Japanese rivals in the trade war are not yielding fruit. At the same time they have obviously added to the burden of Tokyo's far-reaching military commitments to Washington -- Japanese "bills" held by the U.S. Administration. One can hardly doubt that the latter will shortly ask Tokyo "to pay" on those "bills" and demand payment in an even tougher language than before.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF USSR-JAPAN SOCIETY MARKED

OW090945 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 8 Jun 83

[Text] The 5th national convention of the USSR-Japan Society was held in Moscow on 7 June to celebrate the society's 25th founding anniversary. The participants pointed out that the USSR-Japan Society had become a mass organization actively engaged in promoting good-neighbor relations with other countries as well as peace and cooperation throughout the world.

The meeting adopted an appeal calling on the Japanese people engaged in the movement to promote friendly relations with the Soviet Union to make more positive efforts in the antinuclear campaign. The meeting also elected new members to the society's central headquarters. Soviet Maritime Fleet Minister Guzhenko was reelected president of the society.

Japanese Charge d'Affaires (Owada) was present at the meeting.

DRA'S RATEBZAD COMMENTS ON WORLD PEACE

LD091502 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Kabul, June 9 TASS -- The Soviet Union has always come out and continues to come out in favour of peace and social progress. The peace initiatives being put forward by the USSR constitute a realistic programme for averting the threat of nuclear war. It is precisely these initiatives that meet with broad support among all progressive and peace forces of the world, including the Afghan people. This has been stated in an interview with a TASS correspondent by Anahita Ratebzad, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA), chairman of the DRA's organization for peace, solidarity, and friendship. The peaceful policy pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet Government, she pointed out, is the vivid embodiment of the idea of great Lenin. It is not fortuitous that it was precisely the land of the Soviets under the leadership of Vladimir Lenin that became the first state to issue a decree of peace.

Today people of the world need peace as never before. A complex political situation of the world has developed as a result of the militarist ambitions of imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism which tries to put the world on the brink of war, which would entail the death of millions and millions of people.

Under these conditions the Soviet Union's call for peace and security on earth and for curbing the arms race sounds as the voice of reason urging the madmen across the ocean to come to realise what a catastrophe they are leading the world to. This is why the peaceful Afghan people have supported and support the preservation of peace on earth. We hope that the forthcoming world assembly "for peace and life, against nuclear war," the assembly which is due to be convened in Prague soon, will make its contribution to saving mankind from nuclear war, and we are confident that a call to preserve peace on earth will again be voiced from the capital of Czechoslovakia.

USSR-DRA ECONOMIC, TECHNICAL COOPERATION PLANNED

LD100435 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1005 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Kabul, 9 Jun (TASS) -- In Kabul today the signing took place of exchange letters on the further development of Soviet-Afghan economic and technological cooperation.

These documents envisage a 5 year extension of the Soviet-Afghan agreement on economic and technological cooperation, the provision of aid on the Soviet side for the exploitation of joint projects built in Afghanistan, the conducting of geological exploratory operations, the drilling of operational boreholes at gas deposits, and the completion of the construction of a thermal power station in the town of Mazar-e-Sharif and of a mill at the elevator in the town of Baghlan.

It also envisages the construction of a power transmission line from the Soviet-Afghan frontier in the area of Kushka to the Tor Ghondi station, as well as the reconstruction of that railway station.

USSR-GDR JOINT COMMISSION MEETS IN MOSCOW

Discusses Agriculture

LD092129 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] A meeting of the Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation between the USSR and the GDR took place in Moscow 6-9 June. The main directions of cooperation in the sphere of the agro-industrial complex and the GDR's participation in implementing the tasks of the USSR's Food Program were discussed. In particular, large-scale measures were outlined for introducing modern technological processes, creating new capacities and modernizing existing capacities in spheres connected with agricultural production and the procurement, processing, storage, and marketing of agricultural products.

The first agreement was signed on the joint creation of the technology and equipment for the efficient production of fruit and vegetable products and a number of articles of the food industry.

Tikhonov Receives Schuerer

LD091758 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Comrade Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, today received at the Kremlin Comrade Schuerer, candidate member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers and chairman of the GDR State Planning Commission, who is in Moscow in connection with the meeting of the Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Scientific-Technical Cooperation between the USSR and the GDR.

During their conversation they discussed questions related to the work of the commission and the two countries' planning bodies in implementing the agreement on deepening reciprocal economic and scientific-technical links that was reached by the sides during the official friendly visit to the Soviet Union by a GDR party and governmental delegation in May this year.

SOLOMENTSEV RECEIVES SERBIAN OFFICIAL KRSTIC

PM091312 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Jun 83 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In a Comradely Atmosphere"]

[Text] On 3 June M.S. Solomentsev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, received M. Krstic, chairman of the Serbian Committee for Relations With Foreign Countries (SFRY).

During the talk it was noted that contacts between the republics of the USSR and the SFRY play an important part in deepening the traditional relations between the Soviet and Yugoslav peoples who are united by their common aspiration to strengthen peace and security.

Taking part in the talk, which passed in a warm, comradely atmosphere were L.P. Lykova, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; N.I. Maslennikov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the RSFSR Gosplan; V.M. Vinogradov, RSFSR foreign minister; other officials, and M. Drulovic, SFRY ambassador to the USSR.

KOIVISTO ENDS MOSCOW VISIT; HEADS FOR KIEV

Second Andropov Meeting

LD071306 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 7 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 7 TASS -- Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has met in the Kremlin today with President Mauno Koivisto of the Republic of Finland. In the course of the meeting, which proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, views were exchanged on questions of mutual interest.

Details Not Disclosed

LD071943 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1600 GMT 7 Jun 83

[Excerpts] President Mauno Koivisto and CPSU General Secretary Yuriy Andropov held talks alone for just over an hour in Moscow. The statesmen thus unofficially continued the official talks which began yesterday. No information was given today on the content of the talks but the talks will be continued on Friday when President Koivisto's state visit ends. President Koivisto's meeting with Nordic ambassadors in Moscow was also fitted in today's loosely scheduled schedule for the visit. The president reported to them on his talks and the visit.

Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa for his part met the Soviet Premier Nikolay Tikhonov. The talks, which lasted about an hour, concentrated chiefly on matters related to the countries' economic relations.

Send-Off Ceremony Held

PM091159 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 83 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Finnish President's Departure From Moscow"]

[Text] On 8 June Finnish President M. Koivisto, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government, left Moscow for Kiev.

Before his departure a send-off ceremony for the important guest was held in the Kremlin on the square by the Great Kremlin Palace where the state flags of Finland and the USSR were raised.

Finnish President M. Loivisto was warmly seen off by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The following took part in the ceremony: N. A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR Central Committee Politburo, and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; N.S. Patolichev, USSR foreign trade minister; as well as Prime Minister K. Sorsa and other Finnish state figures who are visiting the Soviet Union with the President.

The motorcade then made its way to the airport.

The Finnish president was accompanied to Vnukovo Airport by N.A. Tikhonov, A.A. Gromyko, and V.V. Kuznetsov; as well as G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; USSR ministers and other officials. Representatives of the working people of Moscow also came to see off the president.

At the airport the two friendly countries' flags were raised. A guard of honor was drawn up. And an orchestra played the state anthems of Finland and the USSR.

N. Tikhonov and M. Koivisto reviewed a formation of Soviet servicemen. The send-off ceremony ended with a ceremonial march by the honor guard.

M. Koivisto is being accompanied during his trip by A.F. Vatchenko, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; N.V. Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.M. Sobolev, USSR ambassador to Finland; and other officials.

TV Shows Andropov

LD081448 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 1300 GMT on 8 June carries a 4-minute video recording received with poor reception on Koivisto's departure from Moscow. Video shows Andropov walking stooped, taking short steps, and wearing dark glasses. He is followed by Kuznetsov, Gromyko, Zamyatin, Tikhonov and other officials.

Video shows Andropov from two different sides as he shakes hands with Koivisto, cutting to high-angle shots of Andropov standing unaided, with his aide standing very close by on his right, while Koivisto, Tikhonov, and Gromyko move toward their cars. Video then shows Andropov standing unaided waving his right hand to Koivisto; no trembling can be seen.

Video then shows cars moving away, and Tikhonov, Koivisto, Gromyko, and Kuznetsov standing while the Finnish and Soviet anthems are played; shots of Tikhonov and Koivisto inspecting the troops at the airport; shots of Koivisto shaking hands with Soviet officials; shots of Tikhonov, Koivisto, Gromyko, and Kuznetsov watching the honor guard march past, followed by shots of Koivisto shaking hands with Tikhonov, Gromyko, and Kuznetsov; and finally shots of Koivisto, Tikhonov, Gromyko, and Kuznetsov waving to each other as Koivisto enters the aircraft.

FRANCE'S FOREIGN POLICY 'FOLLOWING' U.S. LINE

'Departing' From 'Independence'

PM091729 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Valentin Falin's "Political Observer's Opinion": "Odds and Ends"]

[Text] The differences of opinion in Paris in connection with the evolution of French policy have reached a high pitch. Prime Minister Pierre Mauroy has let it be understood that he may "submit a motion of confidence" to the National Assembly unless those within the government coalition, who are dissatisfied with the Williamsburg meeting, keep silent.

Meanwhile the press is bringing forth new details. In its evaluations, it turns over the soil in forbidden fields more deeply than is permitted by the rules of the parliamentary game.

The Paris newspaper commentators write: France is departing further and further from its "independent position" vis-a-vis NATO. Engaging in polemics with the French head of state who, naturally, is playing up by every means his role at the conference of the "Seven," while playing down the significance of the concessions he made there, LA LIBERATION speaks of "a new qualitative leap" in the movement along the road of Atlanticism. F. Mitterrand, the newspaper notes in an editorial article, appears from now on to be the most pro-Atlantic president of the Fifth Republic.

LE MONDE asks its readers to put themselves in the president's shoes. He had no other way out but to sign the military-political statement. After all, R. Reagan had "thrice (!) pounded the table with his fist." It seems that this is necessary in high society. There is also the view that F. Mitterrand was, by a ruse, lured into the trap while not having sufficiently keen wits to get out of it unscathed. Who knows, who knows.

But it seems to me that things might have been different had the French president read in good time the confidential document published recently by the newspaper LE MATIN. It was the recommendations submitted to R. Reagan by the U.S. Department of State on the eve of his eyeball-to-eyeball talk with F. Mitterrand. The document, LE MATIN stresses, is interesting because it "expounds the U.S. leaders' opinion of France without unnecessary embellishments." The plain truth, without unnecessary diplomacy.

And what is this opinion? To start with, the authors of the recommendations R. Burt and K. Dam, who are reputed to be "moderates" in the U.S. State Department, enlighten their chief on F. Mitterrand's stance on currency issues, on "increasing the world bank's resources," and on giving aid to developing countries. Attention is drawn to French statements criticizing the deficit in the U.S. federal budget, the level of interest rated, and the dollar exchange rate. It is further noted that F. Mitterrand defends traditional French precepts with stress on his "socialist ideology," but without "ill will toward the Williamsburg meeting or toward the United States."

"The fact that the other Europeans and Chancellor Kohl, in particular, have not supported Mitterrand's proposals," the state department document reads, "could also cool his desire for polemics. And, finally, Mitterrand is coming to Williamsburg weakened politically and economically." This is the main thing, and advantage must be taken of this for the sake of the meeting's success as well as for creating a favorable atmosphere in U.S.-French relations in the coming months.

R. Burt and K. Dam clearly consider these "coming months" extraordinarily important. "Mitterrand," they try to convince Reagan, "is firmly on your side on the problems of the West's security. It is also in our interests, no doubt, that he should continue to give this support. The French showed themselves in a very useful light in Lebanon; they did not undertake any initiatives at all which could have threatened your peace plan for the Near East and have started, perhaps, not to give such vociferous support to Nicaragua and Cuba. After initial opposition and to a greater extent thanks to your demarche toward Mitterrand, the French have gradually come round to our stance on the issue of economic relations between East and West."

It was recommended to R. Reagan "to evaluate highly the sincerity of Mitterrand's anxiety over global problems, while simultaneously noting carefully that we have not always liked the form in which he has voiced it," and to give "a high assessment of his support on questions of the West's security, acknowledging at the same time that we can, with full justification, take a different approach to international economic problems." In other words, it is first and foremost necessary to pin the French president down as regards close cooperation during the implementation of military plans by the United States and the NATO bloc as a whole.

F. Mitterrand could even prove very useful by lending assistance this summer and fall in pursuing the course of frustrating accords in Geneva and ensuring at all costs the start of the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe.

And how about the economy? It can be read between the lines that France's domestic political and economic situation will, by all accounts become further complicated so that very soon Paris officialdom will have no other way out but to bow down before the dollar. The main thing at this moment is not to scare off the birdie, since it will jump of its own accord into the snare that have been set. For the sake of "harmony," the authors of the recommendations even advised against insistence on the adoption of the military-political statement or to be tractable to the utmost on that issue.

R. Reagan only partially followed the advice offered. He set up the Williamsburg spectacular for the sake of the statement which marshalled the "Seven" in a single file, and he had no intention of showing weakness on this very point. For the time being it is certainly not known how he managed to come finally to an understanding with F. Mitterrand, forcing him to accept a raw deal. Even if the White House chief did pound the table with his fist, he could hardly have done it with such force as to shake his French colleague to his very foundations. The Williamsburg twilight concealed something else. Let us wait a little. Some other publication will appear which will suddenly counterbalance the paper by R. Burt and K. Dam which is extremely similar to, as people used to say in olden times, the kiss of Judas.

Increasing Role in NATO

PM090837 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 83 First Edition p 5

[Correspondent Yu. Yakhontov "International Notes": "But What Is The Truth of the Matter?"]

[Text] Bonn 7 Jun -- The fact that the next NATO council session will be held 9-10 June in Paris at the French Government's suggestion has given rise to great satisfaction in official and pro-Atlantic circles in the FRG. The Bonn newspaper GENERAL-ANZEIGER, regarding the invitation of the 16 NATO member-states' foreign ministers to Paris as evidence of France's changing attitude toward its former position within the North Atlantic bloc in 1966, writes that this is just one of many signals made recently by the Socialist government indicating the Socialists' reviewing of the policy of their predecessors, who advocated the country's nonparticipation in the aggressive alliance's military organization.

"The Federal Government," DIE WELT writes in this connection, "attaches particular significance to this NATO council session. This also applies to the fact that this is the first time since 1966 that the bloc's foreign ministers will be meeting in the French capital. In Bonn's view the fact that the decisive appeal before the critical point in the Geneva talks on medium-range weapons will be made specifically from Paris accords fully with the logic of French policy."

Bonn's GENERAL-ANZEIGER writes that the French president has abandoned his former "sham position." The limited independence in defense planning with the help of conventional and nuclear weapons which Paris sought on leaving the NATO military organization and which it continues to talk about can now be seen in a more realistic light, the newspaper writes. "The attempt is no longer made to conceal either from the French or from the world public the close links to the alliance -- not only political, but also military -- which actually exist as a result of the permament presence of French officers on NATO staffs."

There follows quite a frank admission -- which has particular weight in view of the fact that this newspaper is very close to Bonn official circles: "The Soviet Union must draw its conclusion from the fact that in the event of conflict France will play no special role. The allies do not now have to doubt the seriousness of French intentions of returning to the fold of the military organization."

A week ago roughly the same thing was confirmed by the French defense minister, when exercises by French troops took place on West German territory, in the region of (Myuslingen). At that time he spoke of the "interdependence" of the two countries' armed forces and the need for still closer cooperation.

In view of all this, what are we to make of the persistent refusal by France, the United States, and certain other NATO partners to adopt the just Soviet proposal on taking into account at the Geneva talks the French and British nuclear potentials, a refusal which is motivated by the special "national" nature of these nuclear forces?

Mideast, PLO Policies Attacked

LD091839 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS -- TASS Observer Aleksandr Borisov writes:

"A signal from Paris" -- This is how the West German "GENERAL-ANZEIGER" described the fact that the current session of the NATO Council is held in the French capital for the first time in the past 17 years. Indeed, the Atlantic strategists have not been gathering on the banks of the Seine since the time President Charles de Gaulle expelled the NATO headquarters from Paris.

This is not at all the only signal attesting to the departure from the independent foreign policy course that was established in the times of De Gaulle. Among these signals are the prevention of the holding at UNESCO's headquarters in Paris of an international conference on the Palestinian problem which should be held there next August on the decision of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly. It would seem this decision should not have caused any opposition from Par's for having provided its territory for the UNESCO residence and having signed a special diplomatic convention with the United Nations, France has assumed an obligation not to put obstacles to the activity of that international organization implemented in the framework of its charter. This has been confirmed definitely by French Minister of External Relations Claude Cheysson.

Nevertheless, as PLO permanent representative at the United Nations Zhedi Labib Terzi said, an international convention on the Palestinian question, because of the obstacles from the French Government cannot be held at the appointed time in Paris and will be convened at a different place. Trying to justify the obstruction by his government, Claude Cheysson asserted that the conference, allegedly, cannot yield anything but the "expressionof extremist views..."

Whom does this stand suit? There can only be one answer: Tel Aviv and its patrons in Washington. As to PLO representative in Paris Ibrahim as-sous, he described this stand as "scandalous."

It must be noted that the pointer of the compass of the French Middle Eastern policy deflected far from the azimuth that it followed over many years. It will not be amiss to recall that since 1967 this policy has been oriented at the quest of the means of promoting the establishment of a durable and just peace in the Middle East on the multilateral basis with the United Nations participation.

Speaking in the U.S. Congress on February 25, 1970, President Georges Pompidou stressed that such peace can be achieved only through giving up armed conquests and through the solution of the Palestinian problem.

Condemning unambiguously Israel's aggressive sallies, France imposed and confirmed many times the embargo on arms supplies to Tel Aviv, came out with its own initiatives aimed at promoting the solution of complicated Middle Eastern problems.

This policy was ensuring for France an active role in the quest of the roads of ensuring peace in the Middle East and was meeting with a positive response both in the United Nations framework and in Arab countries. This policy was condemned only by the Tel Aviv extremists and certain circles in Washington.

And now a sharp turn has been made. Paris is now declaring energetically against any diplomatic actions of Western Europe in the Middle East taken independently from Washington, is stepping up its contacts with Tel Aviv at every level and, as "QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS" asserts, is even discussing with Tel Aviv the question of the resumption of the deliveries of French armaments.

In what way can this turn be assessed? Apparently, in this region, too, France "is increasingly following in the wake of the U.S. policy," as the Parisian LE MONDE put it.

GREEK PREMIER CRITICIZES U.S., NATO MISSILE PLANS

LD091435 Moscow TASS in English 1126 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Athens June 9 TASS -- Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou has criticized the plans of NATO and the U.S. Administration to deploy new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Speaking before members of parliament from the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK), he said the implementation of those plans would increase the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict.

President Reagan's program concerning nuclear missiles, the head of the Greek Government said, "is destabilizing to an extremely dangerous degree, while the coming decade will be exceedingly precarious". "The U.S. plans of conducting research with a view to developing antimissile systems, the realization of the program for the manufacture of MX missiles and the stationing of Pershing 2's and cruise missiles in Europe from late 1983," Andreas Papandreou went on to say, "might prove to be a no real impulse to world conflagration." [Sentence as received] "It is for the first time ever that we have found ourselves," the Greek prime minister emphasized, "on a road fraught with the danger of a nuclear clash."

Andreas Papandreou urged the removal of nuclear weapons from Greek territory, since they are not subject to control by the Greek Government. He expressed himself in favor of establishing a nuclear weapons-free zone in the Balkan Peninsula, pointing out that this zone could be proclaimed as early as next year.

On current Greek-U.S. talks on U.S. military bases, Andreas Papandreou said that if a corresponding agreement is not reached, Athens will give Washington a year or a year and a half to dismantle its military facilities in Greek territory.

GROMYKO, JORDANIAN ENVOY DISCUSS MIDEAST

LD091742 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT 8 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko received today in the Kremlin Jordan's Ambassador in the Soviet Union Hani al-Khasawinah in connection with the conclusion of his mission in Moscow.

Some questions of Soviet-Jordanian relations have been discussed during a friendly conversation, and the mutual striving for their further development in the political and other fields has been expressed.

When discussing the Middle East situation, Andrey Gromyko has stressed that the agreement imposed by the United States and Israel on Lebanon infringes on Lebanon's independence and sovereignty. The mutual opinion about the need to consolidate the unity of the Arabs to oppose Israel's expansionist plans backed by the USA has been expressed during the conversation.

Andrey Gromyko has confirmed that the Soviet Union declared and declares for a durable and just peace in the Middle East, [and] will continue rendering support to the Arab peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence, against the Israeli aggression, for the ensurance of the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to self-determination and creation of its own state.

Hani al-Khasawinah has expressed gratitude for this invariable policy friendly to Arabs that the Soviet Union conducts in the Middle Eastern affairs.

ARKHIPOV, ALGERIAN AIDES HOLD DISCUSSION

PM081633 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has received Balkacem Nabi, Algerian minister of energy and petrochemical industries. They held a conversation in which Messaoud Ait Chalal, Algerian ambassador to the USSR, and G.K. Zhuravlev, USSR first deputy minister of foreign trade, participated.

USSR TO SUPPLY PLO WITH NEW WEAPONS

GF100900 Doha QNA in Arabic 0835 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] Kuwait, 10 Jun (QNA) -- The Kuwait weekly AL-HADAF, citing well-informed Palestinian sources, reports that the Soviet Union has agreed to supply the PLO with a long list of arms. The agreement was reached in Moscow with Soviet officials during the talks held by Salah Khalaf, alias Abu Iyad, Fatah Central Committee member.

The sources said that the new weapons include antiaircraft missiles, modern armor, and helicopters equipped with sophisticated military reconnaissance equipment. The source said that the arms will be delivered to the PLO in three installments over a period of 3 years through an Arab country that maintains a special relationship with Moscow.

The same sources told AL-HADAF that Yasir Arafat will visit Moscow in late June 1983. The sources said that the Soviet leaders told Salah Khalaf during his recent Moscow visit that they will not support any dissident movement within Fatah.

U.S.-SOVIET MIDEAST COOPERATION DENIED

LD091315 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS -- TASS commentator Vsevolod Polonskiy writes:

It is alleged in Washington that the United States is working with the Soviet Union to secure the withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon. These allegations are downright misinformation.

The Soviet stand on this matter is perfectly clear. The USSR stands for the fulfillment of the U.S. Security Council resolutions calling for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Lebanese territories, which is not envisioned under the Lebanese-Israeli agreement imposed on Lebanon by the United States and Israel.

As for the joint and parallel actions of the United States and the USSR to settle the Middle East conflict, they were provided for by the Soviet-American statement on the Middle East adopted on October 1, 1977. It pointed out that the only correct way to ensure a cardinal solution of every aspect of the Middle East problem was offered by talks within the framework of a Geneva peace conference specifically convened for the purpose with the participation of representatives of all the parties involved in the conflict, including the Palestinian people.

Shortly after the release of that joint statement the United States hurriedly disassociated itself from it. Just yesterday a spokesman for the U.S. Department of State declared that he did not see any prospects for an international conference on the Middle East with Soviet participation.

In practice, the policy of the U.S. Administration is aimed at perpetuating the Israeli occupation of Arab lands, destroying the PLO, and denying the Palestinian people the right of self-determination and to establishing an independent national state.

As for the withdrawal of Syrian troops, the Syrian Government has stated its attitude to this problem on more than one occasion. Syrian Foreign Minister Khaddam said recently that his country was prepared to withdraw its troop contingent from Lebanese territory immediately if only the Israeli occupation troops are pulled out of that country.

The United States and Israel are doing everything possible to avoid resolving the central problem in the Middle East, the problem of the self-determination of the Palestinian people, although it is perfectly clear that the Palestinians will never reconcile themselves to being denied the right to a homeland. The agreement with Israel which was imposed on Lebanon with active U.S. participation cannot resolve the problems posed by the Israeli aggression. This onerous American-Israeli agreement is patently anti-Arab. It legalizes Israeli control of Lebanon and creates a threat to Syrian security. The USSR has put forward a fair program for ensuring peace in the region. In general it does not differ from the position of the Arab countries themselves as it was defined by the Fes conference. The Soviet Union believes that only a collective decision with the participation of all the interested parties, including the USSR, the USA, PLO, and Israel, will bring about a comprehensive and lasting settlement in the Middle East.

SPECIAL ENVOY WALTERS' MISSION IN MIDEAST VIEWED

LD091432 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 8 Jun 83

[Text] Reports from Washington say that President Reagan has sent a special envoy, General Vernon Walters, to the Middle East. According to NEWSWEEK the aim of his mission is to exert pressure on several Arab nations to persuade them to support the Lebanese-Israeli agreement concluded under pressure from Washington. Commentary is by Viktor Yenikeyev:

Gen Walters has, for the time being, taken over from the special envoy of the United States President, Philip Habib, and his assistant Morris Draper, who have been recalled to Washington together with the American ambassadors to Israel, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, and Jordan in what is seen as a tactical maneuver. Gen Walters is to continue shuttle diplomacy travelling from one Arab capital to another to advertise the Lebanese-Israeli agreement. At the moment the chief task of the American Administration is to pressurize Syria into joining the Israeli-Lebanese agreement. American observers believe that the administration is counting on Saudi Arabian mediation in achieving that objective and therefore the Walters mission to Riyadh appears all the more significant.

Judging by the statements made by Arab politicians, Washington's chances of legalizing the Israeli-Lebanese agreement are very slim indeed. Kuwait, the PLO, and a number of Mid-Eastern nations see the agreement as an openly anti-Arab deal serving Israeli interests. Syria rejected the agreement and emphasized that it encroaches on the independence, freedom, and interests of Lebanon, and jeopardizes the security and interests of Syria and consequently the security and interests of all Arabs. Syria was joined by Saudi Arabia, which said that the agreement in its present form is unacceptable. The resolutions of the Arab summit in Fes and appropriate United Nations resolutions demand a total withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from Lebanon without any preconditions. All these resolutions are in force. Under the agreement Israel has retained the control of a considerable part of Lebanese territory, while an Israeli withdrawal is conditional on a long list of stipulations.

According to NEWSWEEK Israeli troops are preparing for a long stay in Lebanon. In the light of these developments, it would be unreasonable to believe that General Walters or his Washington colleagues and any of the Arab leaders would come to an agreement. Reports that Israel is preparing for aggression against Syria destroy any chances for that. The situation in which the United States Administration has found itself is very much similar to the period following the signing of the Camp David accords. As soon as the official ceremonies were over, Washington must have realized that the Israeli-Lebanese agreement creates more problems than it solves. Many observers are saying that American diplomacy in the Middle East is deadlocked once again. It is very difficult indeed to imagine what arguments the United States Administration is going to use to prove that the tragedies of Sabra and Shatila, the blood of thousands of Lebanese and Palestinians, and the Israeli occupation of Lebanon pave the way for peace in the Middle East.

The rhetoric of Gen Walters or the strategic arguments of Washington will hardly help. The traces of Israeli aggression on Arab lands carry more weight than any rhetoric or projects. By attempting to impose the Israeli-Lebanese agreement on the Arabs, Washington is once again demonstrating its support for Israeli aggression and Israel's anti-Arab policies in general.

DELHI RALLY PROTESTS ANTI-TUDEH REPRESSIONS

NC091042 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1800 GMT 8 Jun 83

[Text] The participants in a massive gathering in the Indian capital have called for an end to the pressures and restrictions being imposed on the Tudeh Party of Iran. I. Singh, secretary of the Indian Communist Party National Council and member of Parliament told the participants in a speech he delivered that the Tudeh Party of Iran was among the first ranks of strugglers against the monarchy and that it has persistently defended the country's independence from imperialist machinations. He added that Washington is involved in subverting progressive forces in various parts of the world and that today the Tudeh Party of Iran has become the victim of a reactionary plot. The path on which specific circles in Iran have set foot is leading to the country's return to the axis of U.S. military-political policy and to the revival of the Pentagon's military presence in that country.

I. Signh also referred to the baselessness of the accusation that the Tudeh Party of Iran spied for the Soviet Union, pointing out that the Tudeh Party's members did not have access to any government documents. The Soviet Union has been the persistent defender of Iran's revolution from imperialist machinations and it has extended great moral and political support. The so-called confessions that the Tehran authorities have obtained were extracted from the leaders of the Tudeh Party of Iran through torture, based on the principles that ruled the activities of the shah's SAVAK.

(Singh Turgit), member of the Indian Communist Party Political Office, said: Various countries welcomed the victory of Iran's revolution, but reactionary elements are currently escalating their activities in the country. They are trying to destroy the country's progressive gains and have begun extensive attacks against the country's patriotic forces.

The participants in the Delhi gathering unanimously issued a resolution in which they called for the immediate release of the arrested leaders and members of the Tudeh Party of Iran and for the lifting of the ban on its activities.

SOVIET-ARAB AMITY BODY CELEBRATES ANNIVERSARY

PM081148 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 83 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Friendship Society's Jubilee"]

[Text] The 2 June enlarged session of the board of the Soviet Society for Friendship and Cultural Ties With Arab Countries, held in Moscow, was devoted to the society's 25th anniversary.

The speakers noted that the society's activity reflects the Soviet people's sincere desire for friendship and cooperation with Arab peoples and solidarity with the latter's struggle for national liberation, against the forces of imperialism, Zionism, and reaction.

In his speech Jordanian Ambassador to the USSR Kh. Al-Khasawinahassessed the society's work highly.

The session was attended by the heads of diplomatic missions from a number of Arab countries accredited to the USSR.

ANGOLA'S FAPLA REPORTS 'SUCCESSES' AGAINST UNITA

LD100712 Moscow TASS in English 0625 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] Luanda June 10 TASS -- The People's Armed Liberation Forces of Angola (FAPLA) are carrying out successful operations in southern Angola against the gangs of the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] counter-revolutionary grouping, the Angolan News Agency ANGOP said. Several days ago, ANGOP pointed out, FAPLA units, supported by the local population, foiled the attempt of UNITA armed detachments at capturing Cuima, a populated locality in Huambo province. The enemy suffered considerable losses.

The fresh defeat suffered by UNITA, ANGOP notes, is graphic evidence that any attempts by the bandits and their patrons from the racist Republic of South Africa at preventing a successful advancement of the Angolan revolution are doomed to a failure.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON OAU SUMMIT MEETING

'Difficulties' Reported

LD070746 Moscow TASS in English 0701 GMT 7 Jun 83

[Text] Addis Ababa June 7 TASS -- The Bureau of the 18th session of the assembly of the heads of state and government of the member-countries of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) has held a meeting here. The Bureau was elected in the course of the last OAU summit meeting in Nairobi in June 1981 and included nine countries - Kenya, Gambia, Lesotho, Tanzania, the Congo, Libya, Upper Volta, Uganda, and Angola.

A proposal was made at the meeting to expand the Bureau's composition to 21 states, by including 12 more states, specifically, Cameroon, the Comores, Niger, Ethiopia, Guinea, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Zambia and Tunisia. After that the leaders of all the delegations present here held an unofficial meeting and endorsed this decision of the Bureau, which then continued its meeting in the enlarged composition.

At present the delegations of all OAU member-countries, represented by 29 heads of state, three prime ministers, one vice-president, and 18 ministers and other officials, nave gathered in Addis Ababa.

The decision to convene the Bureau of the 18th Session of the OAU assembly rather than the 12-state "Contact Committee", as planned earlier, was taken because a number of states had once again questioned the legality of the "Contact Committee". The latter was formed in November 1982 by the leaders of 31 states in Tripoli after the failure of the second attempt to convene the 19th Session of the OAU assembly in the Libyan capital. Its opponents, according to informed sources in the OAU, also rejected an attempt to expand the composition of the "Contact Committee" under the pretext that from the very beginning its formation had been illegal, since the conference of the 31 heads of state had been held outside the OAU framework.

The main cause of the differences among the delegations of the countries, which have gathered in Addis Ababa, is still the question of the representation of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic.

'Noble Role'

LD100704 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] The 19th session of the assembly of heads of state and government of the member-countries of the Organization of African Unity is taking place in Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia. Here is a commentary on the latest news with Yevgeniy Kachanov at the microphone:

It can probably be taken as symbolic, comrades, that the highest forum of independent Africa is gathering in the same city where, 20 years ago, the Organization of African Unity arose. According to incoming information, the present session is one of the most representative in the entire history of the OAU. Forty-nine delegations from 50 member-countries of the organization are taking part.

Why did I mention representativeness? The point is that in recent months the Western press has not lacked gloomy predictions on the OAU. Proceeding from the fact that last year the OAU assembly was twice unable to convene because of the differences on a number of generally special questions, the West has begun to speak of some kind of deep schism, and almost of the imminent collapse of this organization. But, of course, for their part, they have made every effort to intensify these differences, for the activity of the OAU is a thorn in the flesh of Washington, which does not want to lose its positions in the African Continent.

Well, as you can see, comrades, the funeral planned by the White House has not come to pass. The political wisdom and the common sense of the overwelming majority of African leaders gathered at the session in Addis Ababa gained the upper hand. The necessity and expediency of holding the session is evident, for it is an organization such as the OAU which can and has to solve the urgent problems facing the peoples of the continent. It is the Organization of African Unity that is due the great credit for the fact that over the past two decades the number of independent states in the continent has been increased by one-third.

It provides much aid for the economic development of African countries and actively fights for the radicals restructuring of international economic relations onto a just basis.

In present conditions when tension in the world is growing through the fault of the forces of imperialism, when the United States and its allies are endeavoring to entangle the African Continent in the network of military bases, it is difficult to overestimate the role of OAU, to be sure. The position of this organization on the issue of consolidating peace and international security is well known.

The Soviet Union, as the greeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers to the participants in the forum in Addis Ababa says, highly appraises the role of the OAU as the tried-and-tested instrument in the joint struggle of the countries and peoples of Africa against imperialism, colonialism, racism, and apartheid for peace and international security.

One has to hope that this noble role is fully displayed also at the present session.

'CONTADORA GROUP' CONVENES ON C.A. SETTLEMENT

PM091257 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 83 First Edition p 5

[Commentary by Vadim Listov: "Without Washington's Tutelage"]

[Text] A conference of foreign ministers from nine Latin American countries has been held in Panama. It was organized by the so-called "Contadora Group" (Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama) for the purpose of achieving a peaceful settlement of the situation in Central America.

It should be noted that the positions of the conference participants are far from identical. Nicaragua is currently the victim of aggression by counterrevolutionary gangs trained and armed by the CIA which are invading its territory from neighboring countries. Honduras, on the other hand, is openly participating in the undeclared U.S. war against Nicaragua, while the governments of El Salvador and Guatemala are giving the interventionists "moral" support. Nevertheless, representatives of all the countries in the region sat down at the negotiating table to begin the search for mutually acceptable ways and means of resolving disputes and settling conflicts in order to avert the threat of war between them.

News agencies reported on the eve of the conference that the participants would discuss such questions as the arms race in the region, border incidents, and would hear a report by a delegation of "Contadora Group" observers who had toured five Central American states.

The Panama conference was held behind closed doors. Neither the substance of the debates nor the report by the delegation of observers was published. One knows only that it was agreed to set up a "technical group" to study various positions and gather information "on each specific case."

Western news agencies write that this decision is the conference's "sole success." When viewed in the light of the real situation in Central America one must see, however, that the success, although small, is symbolic: It leaves the door open for future contacts. This is especially important in view of the fact that the conference information bulletin points out the obvious "intensification of conflicts and exacerbation of tension" in the region. Irrespective of what kind of work the "technical group" accomplishes, the fact remains that the Latin American countries which attended the Panama conference are endeavoring to take -- independently, without Washington's involvement -- the first step toward a peaceful settlement in Central America.

It is no secret that the biggest obstacles on this path have been, and still are, erected by the United States which is interfering in the internal affairs of the region's countries and, banking on military methods, is trying to solve the region's problems to suit itself. Recently Washington again allocated several tens of millions of dollars to the Salvadoran regime, which is being rocked by the blows of the patriots, for military aid and for subversive actions against the legitimate Government of Nicaragua. At the same time it is trying to involve other Central American countries as well as the Honduran military in its aggressive designs against Nicaragua and the Salvadoran patriots. By hampering the solution of the crisis situation in Central America and stepping up the struggle against national liberation movements in that region, Washington is endeavoring to strengthen its military-political positions and impose on the peoples its recipes for political and socioeconomic development.

The facts show that the Latin American countries are capable of seeking and finding ways of peacefully settling regional problems independently, without Washington's interference and tutelage.

U.S. CARIBBEAN MANEUVERS, EXPANSION 'PROVOCATIVE'

LD091058 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] The United States is conducting big military maneuvers in the Caribbean under the Codename Universal Path 83. The Pentagon flexes its military muscles several times a year in the Caribbean, international affairs journalist Aleksandr Baryshev notes. The large-scale Ridex 1-83 war games ended there only a month ago, involving 77 ships, aircraft carriers, and nuclear submarines. Now the Caribbean waters are again being furrowed by the U.S. Navy, quite close to the shores of Cuba.

Washington has arranged the latest sabre-rattling soon after several provocative statements by President Reagan following almost one on another. He made these statements at the regular joint session of Congress, and in Houston and Miami. In them he vigorously denounced Cuba, and well-known superhawk Senator Barry Goldwater, echoing the White House boss, called bluntly for an invasion of the Isle of Freedom.

The current increase in U.S. military activities in the Caribbean is also being extended to Puerto Rico. The Pentagon plans to use this island, which has been turned into an unsinkable aircraft carrier, in connection with U.S. aggressive designs in the region. The 10 U.S. military bases there at present are being hurriedly expanded and modernized to facilitate these plans. The new war games and the expansion of military construction in Puerto Rico cannot, if one takes into account the tense situation in the Caribbean and the Central American region, be evaluated as anything but provocative.

REPORTED CIA ACTIVITY IN NICARAGUA CRITICIZED

LD090142 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 7 Jun 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Georgiy Zabkov]

[Text] A press conference has been held in Managua, at which a statement was made by Cerna, head of the Nicaraguan State Security Board. [film clip shows Cerna speaking] He exposed the criminal activities of the CIA, the American espionage agency, directed towards undermining the Sandinista people's revolution. For this purpose, the CIA is making use of armed aggression, economic pressure, ideological warfare, and secret operations. The CIA also acts as the direct organizer of acts of sabotage and terrorism in Nicaragua. Security organs, Cerna declared, have succeeded in foiling no less than 80 attempts to assassinate leaders of the Sandinista revolution. Photographs and films were shown at the press conference -- as you are seeing now on the screen [shots of various unidentified people approaching cars on the street and Cerna displaying objects with secret compartments] -- confirming the report of the attempt planned on the life of Nicaragua's foreign minister, Miguel d'Escoto. This action was planned by CIA personnel disguised as diplomats of the American Embassy in Nicaragua. The Nicaraguan Foreign Minsitery has declared these three diplomats "personae non gratae". A resolute protest has been made to the U.S. Government.

MOSCOW HOSTS SOVIET-MEXICAN ECONOMIC SYMPOSIUM

PM081339 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ties Strengthening"]

[Text] A Soviet-Mexican symposium on problems of a new international economic order, organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the World Economy and International Relations and the Mexican Center for Economic and Social Studies of Developing Countries, was held in Moscow from 29 May through 1 June. A delegation from the center headed by its general director, L. Echeverria Alvarez, former president of Mexico, participated in the symposium. On the Soviet side, leading specialists in the sphere of international economic relations and the economies of developing countries took part.

There was an exchange of opinions on urgent problems of the developing countries' struggle to restructure international economic relations. The symposium participants said that the chief blame for the lack of progress at the talks on establishing a new international economic order lies with the Western countries. In this connection it was pointed out that at the recently concluded Williamsburg conference of the leaders of seven major capitalist countries, no steps were taken toward the developing countries' demands in the economic sphere.

The symposium participants discussed possibilities for the further development of cooperation between socialist and developing countries.

H. Flores de la Pena, Mexican ambassador to the USSR, participated in the symposium's work.

BRIEFS

ARGENTINE POWER STATION -- The Salto Grande hydroelectric station has been put into operation in Argentina on the Uruguay river, which borders on the country of the same name. It was built with the technical assistance of the USSR. Salto Grande is equipped with turbines, regulators, and generators built in Leningrad and Kharkov. [Excerpts] [Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 6 Jun 83 LD]

DRAFT LAW ON LABOR COLLECTIVES DISCUSSED

PM081326 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 31 May 83 p 1

[Editorial: "The Labor Collective"]

[Excerpt] There are many thousands of labor collectives in our country. As the primary cell of socialist society they must increase the country's material and spiritual wealth, make rational use of existing resources, be ever mindful of the collective's members and of the improvement of their working, living and recreational conditions, and foster a high level of organization and conscious discipline in every worker.

Labor collectives' rights and duties in a developed socialist society are clearly set out in the USSR Constitution. The draft law on labor collectives and on the enhancement of their role in the management of enterprises, organizations, and establishments develops and crystallizes the Constitution's provisions. This document has been discussed everywhere and has left no one unmoved. The editorial office has received numerous letters from workers, specialists, scientists, and economic leaders. Unanimously endorsing the draft law and stressing its enormous importance and timeliness, our readers have made numerous suggestions which, in their authors' view, would help to substantially supplement the draft law and clarify certain of its provisions. For all the diversity of these recommendations and comments, the letters' authors stress above all else the extensive rights enjoyed by labor collectives and their heavy responsibility for everything relating to intensifying production and consolidating order, conscious discipline, and organization. This is the basis for the continued increase in public wealth and the people's well-being.

The discussion of the draft law on labor collectives and the press demonstrated once again with the utmost clarity the great advantages of socialist democracy and true people's power based on the working people's creative powers. A sense of being a genuine master and of responsibility for all the country's affairs and profound concern to ensure that they are going well has been clearly demonstrated in the nationwide support for the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum policy of comprehensively strengthening labor, planning and state discipline. It was no coincidence that many suggestions made in the course of discussing the draft law were aimed at enhancing labor collectives' role in combating violators of discipline, loafers, slackers, and drunkards.

Those who took part in the discussion devoted much attention to the team form of labor organization and remuneration, and to the collective's role in staffing the team and planning and organizing its work, and in providing people with moral and material incentives and educating them. Our newspaper has written about the team at Leningrad's Metallurgy Plant headed by Vladimir Alferyev, where team norms are being successfully employed; about Viktor Truktanov's close-knit collective at the Magnitogorsk Matallurgical Combine; about Vladimir Adamenko's progressive team of drift miners from Magadan; and many others. Progressive teams' experience convincingly demonstrates that working on the basis of a unified job-order and the team contract system are helping to both increase labor productivity, strengthen discipline, and foster an active life stance in everyone.

During the discussion, in addition to suggestions and comments on the draft law, many criticisms and recommendations aimed at improving current work and eliminating shortcomings of one sort or another were made at meetings of collectives and in the press. Economic leaders and enterprises' party and social organizations must take effective steps on the basis of them and ensure the requisite conditions for the successful fulfillment of plans and socialist pledges in the course of the labor vigil to mark the 25th anniversary of the movement for a communist attitude to labor.

Socialist competition in honor of this jubilee is gathering momentum. The initiative of the collectives of Moscow's top enterprises has met with broad support at plants and factories, on construction sites and in railroad transport. Good news is already coming in from all over. In the course of 25 weeks of shock labor industrial personnel are to try and consolidate and multiply the positive results of the first 4 months of the year. Every labor collective must make its contribution to the solution of the tasks of the current year and the 5-year plan as a whole by exploiting all its potential and reserves in order to increase production efficiency and labor productivity strengthen order and discipline.

The nationwide discussion of the draft law on labor collectives is Soviet democracy in action. While the bosses of the capitalist world and their subservient media shout themselves hoarse about human rights in bourgois society, man's basic right to work is flouted there, evidence of which is the tens of millions of jobless persons. Only socialism gives the working people real rights and freedoms and creates the necessary conditions for increasing their well-being, political consciousness, level of culture and education, and active participation in running all society's affairs.

USSR DEPUTY COMMUNICATIONS MINISTER DIES 'SUDDENLY'

PM091427 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 6

[Obituary of D.I. Mangeldin: "In Memory of a Comrade"]

[Excerpts] Soviet communications workers have suffered a grave loss. Danyar Iskanderovich Mangeldin, USSR deputy minister of communications and candidate of economic science, died suddenly on 7 June 1983.

D.I. Mangeldin was born in 1922 in Samarkand.

[Signed] A group of comrades

SEVERAL EXECUTED FOR ECONOMIC CRIMES IN GEORGIA

NC291312 Paris AFP in English 1258 GMT 29 May 83

[Text] Moscow, May 29 (AFP) -- Several persons guilty of "economic crimes" in Georgia have been executed, Eduard Shevarnadze, first secretary of the Georgian Republic, announced recently.

In a speech on May 24 to the plenum of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party, published today in the local newspaper ZARYA VOSTOKA, Mr Shevarnadze revealed that several persons accused of "misappropriating socialist goods" or speculation had been executed after trial. Others had been sentenced to long jail sentences, he added.

But two new trials had started against managers of a fruit and vegetable depot and of a oil company for pillaging socialist property, Mr Shevarnadze added.

In the last seven years, at least 300 Georgian civil servants guilty of nepotism and lack of discipline had been sacked, he stated in a recent interview to PRAVDA.

There were still numerous cases being investigated, he added. The state would not tolerate attacks on socialist property, he said.

ACADEMICIAN VIEWS PRODUCTIVITY, WAGE INCENTIVES

OW100259 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 0730 GMT on 2 June carries the 30-minute "Lenin's University of the Millions" program presented by Prof P.G. Bunich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Prof P.G. Bunich Presents the 10th and final installment in the "Economical Economy" series entitled "Reflecting on Your Letters."

Professor Bunich opens the program by noting that most of the viewers' letters are concerned with the question of stimulating an interest in labor. The concerns expressed in the first three letters -- improving product quality, fulfilling plans, determining efficient methods of operation by the collectives -- are touched on in interviews with individuals participating in training seminars at the VDNKh -- Exhibition of Achievements of the USSR's National Economy.

Turning to the question of stimulating labor productivity, Professor Bunich mentions the incentive system introduced at the Sumy M.V. Frunze Machine-building Production Association. Under this system, the workers receive bonuses based on the percentage of the production capacities utilized. This results in pledges by the workers to fulfill more intensive plans and thereby utilize maximum capacities. Professor Bunich adds that this system will be tested at 257 machine-building enterprises that will be called "support enterprises [opornyye preopriyatiya]." To those interested in studying incentive systems, he recommends a book in the "Socialism Experience, Problems and Prospects" series entitled "Perfecting the Management Mechanism: Experience and Problems."

On the subject of workers who are reluctant to make pledges to fulfill intensive plans because they feel they will subsequently be given even more intensive plans, Professor Bunich cites the example of a Voroshilovgrad light industry factory that independently pledges to fulfill intensive plans. The ministry concerned has noticed a rise in productivity at this factory and now no longer imposes production targets on the enterprise.

The matter of foreign firms employing efficiency experts is also discussed. Professor Bunich says: "Primarily it is most important to have an incentive for good results, then everyone will be an efficiency expert. This is the most important thing for us." Professor Bunich goes on to say that the idea of management consultants deserves serious attention.

Noting that a problem of inadequate supplies to enterprises exists, Professor Bunich reveals that research has shown that the organization of enterprises is the main reason for poor production, and adds that economic penalties should be more effectively implemented against managers of enterprises who are guilty of producing inadequate supplies.

Following video interviews with VDNKh seminar participants on the need for producing better quality goods, Professor Bunich addresses the topic of pay for engineering and technical workers. He states that "with the external, equal pay level of engineers and, broadly speaking, of engineering and technical workers, there ought to be pay differentials based on the performance of the worker." He notes that not everyone at an enterprise needs to participate in the 40 percent progressive price rate wage system. Professor Bunich continues: "Resolutions adopted by the party and government in 1979 on improving the economic system provide a method for paying engineering and technical workers an additional 30 percent of their fixed salary for those whose work is better." Professor Bunich then notes the new Shchekino method, whereby construction organizations are given a common wage fund to be distributed equally among workers. Therefore, the fewer the workers in a collective, the more salary they receive.

On the subject of foremen's salaries, Professor Bunich points out that "this is a sore point." He then goes on to read a letter from Voroshilovgrad which says: "Presently everything is the wrong way around. A worker in the third wage category [razryad] receives R160-170, but a foreman only receives R140-150." Bunich then introduces a video report on a senior foreman at the Mytishchi Machine-Building Plant. The plant's deputy manager reports that his plant has introduced a grading system for foreman whereby foremen first class receive an additional 20 percent of their salary, foremen second class 15 percent, and additional bonuses are given depending on the annual work results. He notes: "The foreman's average salary therefore amounts to the quite respectable sum of approximately R240-250."

The question of industrial robots is then reviewed and professor Bunich points out that there are no assembly lines producing industrial robots. He also adds that smaller enterprises are not adapted to robot technology. A viedo report showing industrial robots is followed by a brief talk by Academician A.G. Aganbegyan who highlights the importance of the person, and especially the manager, in production.

In conclusion, Professor Bunich reviews the topics covered in the "Economical Economy" series and adds that the series will continue in October.

KAZAKH SSR TO INCREASE CONSUMER GOODS PRODUCTION

LD081553 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1405 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Excerpt] The Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh SSR have examined the additional measures to be taken to provide the population with consumer goods in 1983-85, and have adopted an appropriate resolution.

The resolution notes that although the republic has become more active in the work to step up the production of consumer goods, the volume of production of many kinds of goods still lags behind the growing demand of the population in 1982. A number of ministries and departments failed to ensure a complete fulfillment of the tasks for producing goods in popular demand and of prime necessity. Many heavy machinery shops of chemical and other industrial enterprises have failed to organize specialized sections and shops to produce consumer goods. The ministries of Light Industry, Local Industry and the Food Industry, as well as of the Fruit and Vegetable Industry, are slow to solve the problems of organizing and distributing the production of the goods that are necessary to the population, and the problems of improving their quality and variety.

In some oblasts businesslike cooperation has not been established among the industrial enterprises, planning organizations and trading organizations, which would be directed at seeking additional commodity resources by maximal utilization of local possibilities. For these reasons it often happens that the simplest goods are brought in from a distance, instead of being produced locally.

The resolution adopted establishes the tasks for the enterprises within the republic's jurisdiction to produce an additional R60 million worth of consumer goods in 1983 through a fuller use of internal reserves, materials saved during manufacture, and local sources of raw materials. It also establishes the tasks for the production of goods of improved quality and having more desirable consumer characteristics.

RECENT CROP SOWING PROGRESS SUMMARIZED

CSA Report Cited

LD082341 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Jun 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] As the USSR Central Statistical Administration has reported, by 6 June spring crops had been sown on over 141 million hectares. Farms in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and south Kazakhstan have started to harvest winter graincrops. On kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the procurement of feed continues. Sown and natural grasses have been given their first mowing on an area of over 10 million hectares.

Agriculture Ministry Report

LD081402 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0810 GMT 8 Jun 83

["In the Country's Fields" review by journalist Mikhail Kustov]

[Text] According to reports from the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the sowing of agricultural crops has, in practice, been completed. Mass sowing in the eastern regions of the country has almost been completed; the same is the case in the trans-Urals area, North Kazakhstan and Western and Eastern Siberia. The sowing of millet is nearing completion; the sowing of rice has been completed.

The best agrotechnical conditions have taken place for the sowing of buckwheat in the oblasts of the Urals and Western Siberia. Mass sowing of soya is in progress in the zone that is the main soya-producing zone: the Far East. However, land cultivators are currently experiencing some difficulties due to a considerable excess of moisture in the soil.

Cotton cultivators have many concerns now, too. Inter-row cultivation has begun on the areas sown to cotton. The gathering in of the vegetable harvest and the procurement of feed are gathering pace. The gathering in of winter barley has begun in the Central Asian republics. The harvest makes land cultivators happy. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes are obtaining grain yields of more than 30-35 quintals per hectare.

RSFSR CSA's Data

LD012036 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1904 GMT 31 May 83

[Text] According to the latest figures from the RSFSR CSA, 89 percent of the plan for sowing spring crops in the republic has been completed. Sowing is being completed by farmers in difficult weather conditions in the eastern regions. In the last few days, spring crops, mainly grain, have been planted here on 1.5 million hectares each day. Sowing of groat crops and soya is continuing in the republic. The planting of potatoes is coming to an end.

INVENTORS, RATIONALIZERS SOCIETY HOLDS CONGRESS

CPSU Central Committee Greetings

LD250820 Moscow TASS in English 0735 GMT 25 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 25 TASS -- The CPSU Central Committee has sent a message of greetings to the Sixth Congress of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Innovators. The congress opened in Moscow today. The message points out that over the 25 years of its activities the All-Union Society of Inventors and Innovators has grown into a mass organisation which unites 13 million people. The freedom of scientific and technical creative activity is guaranteed for the citizens by the Constitution of the developed socialist society. All-round support for invention and innovation in the USSR is an integral part of state policy. It is aimed at creating all opportunities for the real blossoming of the creative initiative of Soviet people.

The CPSU Central Committee has expressed confidence that the country's inventors and innovators, by widely using the gained experience, will achieve new successes in the striving for scientific and technical progress and will make a worthy contribution to the successful implementation of the decisions of the 26th Congress of the CPSU and of the economic and social development plans of 1983 and of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan period as a whole.

Dolgikh Addresses Congress

LD251932 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 25 May 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] The Sixth Congress of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers opened today in the Great Kremlin Palace.

In the presidium are Comrades Grishin, Dolgikh, and Ryzhkov; Comrade Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU; senior workers from the CPSU Central Committee; heads of ministries and departments; scientists; and the best production workers. Also taking part in the congress are guests from foreign countries. [video shows Ryzhkov, Dolgikh, Grishin, Baybakov, Shalayev, Academician Aleksandrov and other Soviet officials and foreign guests in the presidium. Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 25 May adds that Comrade Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, was also present in the presidium]

Comrade Dolgikh, CPSU Central Committee secretary, delivered a message from the CPSU Central Committee:

[Begin Dolgikh video recording] The CPSU Central Committee heartily welcomes the delegates of the Sixth Congress of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers, and all the country's innovators who are in the vanguard of technical progress. [applause]

The Communist Party considers the workers' technical creative work as one of the most important forms of their participation in the development of the economy and production management. In implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, inventors and rationalizers are making a big contribution to raising the effectiveness of social production and to further strengthening our homeland's might. In the 2 years of the current 5-year plan, a saving of R13.9 trillion has been achieved through implementing their proposals in the national economy.

In his speech at the November 1982 Party Central Committee Plenum Comrade Andropov, Yuriy Vladimirovich, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted that further raising the effectiveness of production and its intensification are impossible without exploiting the latest achievements of science, technology, and advanced experience. It is the duty of all inventors and rationalizers to search for new technical solutions ensuring an uninterrupted increase in labor productivity, an improvement in the quality of output, the rational use of material labor resources, and a reduction in wastage.

The tasks set by the party on implementing the USSR's Food Program and the development of the fuel-and-energy complex require close attention. Each innovator can and must increase his contribution to agriculture and to creating highly-efficient and reliable equipment for it, and to increasing the extraction of fuel and production of electricity and thermal energy.

Mechanization and automization of production, a reduction on this basis of the ratio of manual labor and heavy physical work, and the creation of safety equipment are of important significance. A solution to these tasks will enable work to be more creative, attractive, and highly efficient. Each valuable proposal should be taken under public control, and these should be introduced into production as quickly as possible.

The CPSU Central Committee wishes the Sixth Congress of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers fruitful work, and expresses confidence that the country's inventors and rationalizers, by broadly utilizing the experience they have accumulated, will achieve fresh successes in the struggle for scientific-technical progress and will make a worthy contribution to the successful fulfillment of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the plans for economic and social development in 1983 and the 11th 5-Year Plan as a whole. [applause; end recording]

Review Report Given

LD241430 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 25 May 83

[Excerpt] The Sixth Congress of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers opened today in the Great Kremlin Palace.

Comrade (?Tyurin), chairman of the Central Council of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers, delivered a review report. On behalf of all inventors and rationalizers in the country, he thanked the CPSU Central Committee for its high praise for their work and for its warm words of greeting.

TAVRIYA ELECTROPHORESIS EXPERIMENT RESULTS VIEWED

LD011426 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television service in Russian at 0840 GMT on 28 May carries the "Man, Earth, and Universe" program presented by Pilot-Cosmonaut Vitality Sevastyanov. The second item on the program deals with results of the "Tavriya" experiment carried out by Leonid Popov, Sventlana Savitskaya, and Aleksandr Serebrov on Salyut-7 last year. After a film clip of the flight, showing the cosmonauts and equipment used in the experiment, the video cuts to show the Crimean Medical Institute, one of the first in the USSR to study in depth the electrophoresis method of obtaining pure biologically active substances.

German Vasilyevich Troitskiy, corresponding member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, who led the work, is then shown speaking at the medical institute, saying that when, under the "Tavriya" experiment, electrophoresis was tried in space, it turned out that it yielded substances of enhanced purity -- finer fractions of albumin were obtained. As Troitskiy speaks the video intercuts to shots of microbiologists examining material from the experiment and shots of the material derived in the experiments. He says some extremely pure albumin compounds are worth millions of rubles a gram, but they are used in very small quantities -- in milligrammes -- and the whole process is actually very compact, and ideal for the confined space of an orbiting laboratory.

The commander notes that when the electrophoresis laboratory at the Chemistry Department of the Crimean Medical Institute received the first results of the "Tavriya" experiment, researchers were "stunned." They "exceeded all expectations." He notes that substances purified as far as possible on earth separated into five more fractions in space and that the productivity of the process rose by hundreds of times. This opens up the possibility of obtaining a more accurate weapon in the battle against the invisible agents of disease, and also a less toxic one he adds.

Gennadily Yuryevich Azhitskiy, the head of the electrophoresis laboratory, is then shown in a laboratory saying that among the samples returned from space by Valentin Lebedev and Anatoliy Berezovoy -- samples of compounds which separated into a number of fractions -- was human albumin serum, which had been subjected to purification on earth and then, by the electrical focusing method, was separated on the "Tavriya" installation on board Salyut-7. The compound was separated into five discrete fractions, and three of the five were returned to earth for analysis. It can be concluded that electrophoresis methods in weightlessness lead to an increase in the resolving power of the method -- by four or five times for electrophoresis -- to ten times for electrical focusing.

Troitskiy returns to comment that it had been supposed that the equation determining the movement of substances in an electrical field did not include a gravity factor. The "Tavriya" experiment surprisingly showed, in fact, that the relationship between field and particles was not identical on earth and in space. The potential for purifying biologically active albumins such as harmones and peptides in space is great, troitskiy concludes.

USTINOV TO COMMAND BALTIC MILITARY EXERCISE

LD091700 Moscow TASS in English 1604 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS -- An exercise involving troops and naval forces will be held in the territory of the Baltic region and Western Belorussia under the command of Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Ustinov, USSR defence minister, from June 29 to July 4, 1983. The exercise will be aimed at perfecting the combat cohesion and interaction of the command, formations and units of various arms and services of the Armed Forces of the USSR in conducting joint combat activities.

PRAVDA INTERVIEWS KGB BORDER GUARD CHIEF

PM081127 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 83 First Edition p 2

[Unnamed PRAVDA correspondent's interview with Hero of the Soviet Union Army General V.A. Matrosov, chief of the USSR KGB Border Guards, under the rubric "Today Is Border Guard Day": "Sacred and Inviolable" -- date and place unspecified]

[Text] On the eve of the holiday, Hero of the Soviet Union Army General V.A. Matrosov, chief of the USSR KGB Border Guards, replied to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent.

Question: A year has passed since our last meeting. Tell me, please, about life on the Soviet border this year and the tasks which the border troops are tackling today.

Answer: Taken overall, life on the border is intense.

The extent of the USSR's borders is enormous -- over 60,000 km. Naturally the situation varies in its different sectors. The border was, and remains, a sphere in which interstate relations are manifested very vividly.

With the socialist community countries the rhythm of border life is determined by the constant expansion of economic and cultural ties between our fraternal peoples. The protection of the border there is carried out in close cooperation with the border guards of those countries.

Normal activity is carried out and order is maintained in many other sectors of our border, too.

At the same time, in connection with the general aggravation of the international situation caused by the actions of well-known aggressive circles of imperialist states, the situation in a number of sectors of the USSR's border is the object of our special attention. The class enemies do not conceal their aggressive aims. In recent years, the imperialist special services have been more active than ever before, carrying out espionage against our country, performing acts of ideological sabotage, striving to harm the Soviet economy, and increasing tension on our borders.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government have set the Border Guards the task of ensuring the reliable protection and defense of the motherland's borders. The law "On the USSR State Border" says: "The protection of the USSR's state border is the most important and integral part of the defense of the socialist fatherland. The USSR's state border is inviolable. Any attempts to violate it will be stopped." This is the chief thrust of the activity of military councils, commanders, staffs and political organs.

The personnel of the border troops are profoundly aware of the whole complexity and acuteness of the international situation and their responsiblity for the security of the motherland's borders. Their lofty ideological tempering, excellent combat training, splendid standard of technical equipment and heightened sense of vigilance help the defenders of the Soviet borders to successfully combat enemy agents and ideological saboteurs.

Questions: Tell me, please, what new elements the law "On the USSR State Border" has introduced into border service.

Answer: It is known from the history of the border troops that the first legislative act on the protection of the Soviet republic's borders was the decree of the Soviet of People's Commissars signed by V.I. Lenin on 28 May 1918. The law "On the USSR State Border" fully preserves the ideas of Lenin's decree and conforms to the norms of international law.

What new elements should I sing out? Following Lenin's behest, the Communist Party and its Central Committee at every historical stage of development of our society have established the tasks of the border troops, proceeding from the special features of the international situation and the need to ensure the reliable defense of the political and economic interests of the Soviet state and its sovereignty. The law reflects the objective necessity of further stepping up the protection of our motherland's borders in the contemporary complex international conditions. It defines the place and role of the defense of the Soviet borders in the overall system of the country's defense. The demand on border troops has substantially increased.

Our party and the Soviet Government unswervingly follow a course of peace and of strengthening friendship and cooperation among the peoples. The CPSU's peace-loving policy was also reflected in the law "On the USSR State Border."

However, for reasons beyond our control, complex and undesirable situations which threaten the country's security arise at times on certain sectors of the border. While consistently pursuing a line of peacefully resolving any problems arising on the border, the Soviet Union at the same time has always given a due rebuff to anybody who has dared encroach on the inviolability of our border. Precisely for this reason, the law invested the border troops with all the necessary rights, including even the right to use weapons and combat equipment, to repulse armed attack and in other cases stipulated by the law.

It must be stressed particularly that the law vividly reflects the profoundly internationalist relations with neighboring socialist community countries. The borders with these countries are borders of a new type -- borders of friendship and cooperation.

The law makes it incumbent on Border Guards, together with Soviet organs, to preserve the country's natural, oceanic and river resources.

The constant support of working people is a splendid tradition and an important source of our strength. Now the law reinforces the participation of working people in the protection of the state border as one of the important and long-established forms of fulfillment of patriotic duty in defense of the fatherland by Soviet citizens.

Question: Vadim Aleksandrovich, twice a year young reinforcements join the border troops. Border service is not easy. And that means the process of development of the young serviceman is obviously quite complex!

Answer: From his very first steps in the service, the young solider is surrounded by the attention and concern of our commanders and political workers (let me note: for the most part these are people with higher education). They teach young servicemen to defend the motherland just as Andrey Babushkin and Andrey Korobitsyn, Nikita Kaymanov and Aleksey Makhalin, Fedor Morin, Aleksey Lopatin, Ivan Chernopyatko, the legendary border guard-pathfinder Nikita Fedorivich Karatsupa and many, many others defended it.

Service on the border promotes the ideological and physical maturation of servicemen and tempers their characters. The Arctic Border Guards' service, for example, is harsh: the long polar night, the absence of roads, blizzards, frosts -- sometimes 60 degrees below zero.... The patrol paths of the eastern and southern border sections stretch for tens of thousands of kilometers across the wilds of the taiga, precipices, deserts and glaciers. In the Pamirs and the central Tian Shan, there are outposts located at a height of around 4,000 meters....

Appraising the martial labor of the border servicemen at its true worth, the motherland displays daily maternal concern for them. In recent years, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have adopted a whole range of measures whose implementation has raised the border troops to a higher new level in their development. We have everything necessary for the successful protection of the state border: machines of various classes and functions, high-speed ships, aircraft, and helicopters, and electronic instruments.

The material and everyday situation of the Border Guards has also improved considerably. New equipment for Border Guard details has been introduced and the ration norms have been revised. The spiritual requirements of the personnel are being met more fully. Even the most remote of our outposts do not feel cut off from the cultural centers today.

Party and soviet organs in the border regions give us invaluable help in educating the border servicemen. The collectives of enterprises, sovkhozes, kolkhozes and creative unions act as patrons to many of our outposts, ships and subunits. We are pleased that these living and indissoluble links are strengthening from year to year.

Indeed, border service is not easy, but whoever completes this service receives an excellent tempering for the whole of his life.

Question: How are the servicemen celebrating Border Guard Day -- your glorious holiday!

Answer: Primarily by vigilant and reliable protection of the border. Wherever you look today -- at the border outpost named for Hero of the Soviet Union Viktor Usov, the border patrol ship named for the 26th CPSU Congress, or a squadron of pilots of the Red Banner Baltic Border District -- everywhere intensive service and training are underway. Border details walk the patrol paths, operators of technical observation posts keep watch, and patrol ships plow the ocean expanses. The rhythm of border life is intense.

Our servicemen live according to the same thoughts and aspirations as all Soviet people. They warmly approve and support the CPSU's domestic and foreign policy. Socialist competition has been broadly mounted at outposts, on ships and at checkpoints. Our leading units, in which officers A. Savanyavichus, V. Karachevtsev, A. Bryukhovetskiy, A. Kotlyarov, A. Ivchatov, and V. Bondarenko serve, have achieved great successes in the protection of the border and in combat and political training. From day to day the number of excellent subunits, teams and crews is growing and the ranks of excellent servicemen and qualified specialists are increasing.

With great enthusiasm, the border troops personnel welcomed the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum decisions. Fervently supporting our party's decisions, the servicemen are seeking new successes in combat service. As always, the communists and Komsomol members are in the vanguard of this struggle. By personal example they inspire the servicemen to successfully fulfill socialist pledges and increase the reliable protection of the border.

CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Yu.V. Andropov said at the ceremonial session to mark the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation: "In reviewing what has been accomplished, we naturally pay most attention to what still remains to be done." This also applies to the border troops, who are faced with responsible tasks in ensuring the security and inviolability of the socialist motherland's borders.

The Border Guards assure the party and the Soviet people that they will devote all their strength to the cause of ensuring the country's state security and the reliable protection of its sacred borders.